DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 982 EA 026 877

AUTHOR	Doyle, Denis P.
TITLE	Where Connoisseurs Send Their Children to School: An Analysis of 1990 Census Data To Determine Where School Teachers Send Their Children to School.
PUB DATE	May 95
NOTE	132p.; Report prepared with the research assistance of Amanda C. Rice.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Education Reform, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 920, Washington, DC 20036 (complete data available on flexible data discs for a copying fee).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Catholic Schools; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditures; *Parent Attitudes; *Private Schools; Public Schools; Racial Segregation; Religious Education; *School Choice; Socioeconomic Status; *State Church Separation; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	*Teachers as Parents

ABSTRACT

This publication reports findings of an analysis of 1990 United States Bureau of Census data that determined where school teachers send their children to school. Findings indicate that the majority of all parents in the United States sent their children to public schools. As a group, teachers were more likely than the public at large to enroll their children in private school (17 percent compared to 13 percent). Public school teachers were slightly less likely than the general population to send their children to private school (12 and 13 percent, respectively). Parents with higher incomes were much more likely to enroll their children in private schools than were low-income parents. However, among teachers, income was a moderate predictor of the propensity to use private education. White parents in general were somewhat more likely than their non-white counterparts to use private schools. However, black public school teachers use private schools more than white teachers (almost 13% compared to 12%). Finally, in the largest urban areas, public school teachers were more likely than the population at large to enroll their children in private school. Forty-seven tables are included. (LMI)

ED 384 982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 026 877

DOYLE ASSOCIATES
110 Summerfield Road
Chevy Chase MD 20815

301-986-9350
FAX 301-907-4959

WHERE CONNOISSEURS SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOL:

AN ANALYSIS OF 1990 CENSUS DATA

TO DETERMINE WHERE SCHOOL

TEACHERS SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOL

BY

DENIS P. DOYLE

WITH THE RESEARCH ASSISTANCE OF

AMANDA C. RICE

MAY, 1995

published and distributed by

THE CENTER FOR EDUCATION REFORM

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This essay, its supporting tables and the special Census data runs that made them possible, was made possible by the generosity of the Bradley Foundation, Milwaukee WI. Without Bradley's vision and patience, this work could not have been accomplished. In particular, Bill Schambra's support and encouragement is gratefully acknowledged.

I also owe a special debt of gratitude to Amanda C. Rice who spent countless hours pouring over complex and confusing tabular presentations as a prelude to preparing the set of tables that appear at the end of this document. The work could not have been accomplished without her high intelligence, resourcefulness and energy.

Any errors of fact or interpretation are mine alone.

The essence of education is that it be religious. Pray, what is religious education? A religious education is an education that inculcates duty and reverence. Duty arises from our potential control over the course of events. Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice. And the foundation of reverence is this perception, that the present holds within itself the complete sum of existence, backwards and forwards, that whole amplitude of time, which is eternity.

Alfred North Whitehead
The Aims of Education

Hypocrite lecture - mon semblable - mon frere.

Charles Baudelaire
Les Fleurs de Mal 1861
Au Lecteur

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A PREFATORY NOTE ON THE NUMBERS: A MODERN MORALITY TALE

Numbers are the life blood of research, and how one gets them is, at least on occasion, of more than passing interest. In this case, the story may be worth telling. Not surprisingly, it is a story of pure serendipity, or as we say in the trade, a triumph of luck over planning.

In the mid-80s my attention was drawn to a fascinating survey conducted by the *Detroit Free Press.* Reported in the October 5, 1983 issue of *Education Week,* the survey found that Michigan Public School Teachers were twice as likely as the public at large to send their children to private school. I mentioned the item to a colleague from Northwestern University who I ran into at a meeting. Not long after that he sent me a copy of a small, well written weekly, the *Chicago Reporter*, a newsletter that chronicled civil rights activities in Chicago. They too had discovered how many teachers sent their children to private school. The numbers were astonishing. They found that 46% of Chicago public school teachers send their children to private school, compared to 22% of all Chicagoans. I called the *Reporter* offices and they were most helpful: the 5% sample of the 1980 census was the source.

A few more calls produced the following information. Yes, the Bureau of the Census has coded its 5% sample in such a way that one could find out, at least in some states and cities, where teachers send their children to school. The American Enterprise Institute acquired the tapes and the Brookings Institution ran them, on their large computes, at cost. As it turned out, the 1980 data only permitted us to look at 13 states and 25 cities, but the results were provocative.

They produced the study (co-authored with Terry Hartle), titled *Where Public School Teachers Send Their Children to School: A Preliminary Analysis,* released by the American Enterprise Institute in the Spring of 1986. Over the ensuing years the numbers from the study were bandied around in various settings, culminating in two interesting events in 1992, one a colloquy between George Will and Keith Geiger (president of the NEA) on a syndicated television program in which Geiger essentially stipulated that the "bad" news was true (the first acknowledgment of the study by any education special interest group); the other was a reference to it in a campaign speech by then President Bush. In both cases the study results were quoted to make a point about policy. Rare in the world of research, to say the least.

If nothing else these events sparked my curiosity about the 1990 data. The Bureau of the Census told me that it would be available in the early 90s, much ahead of the 80s, and sure enough, when the code books were released, they indicated that the information I needed was there. That is, the 5% sample, allegedly reported where teachers, public and private, sent their children to school, public or private, by race, income, and residence (city, suburb or rural), as well as state. The same information was available for the public at large, by the same categories. This time the numbers were available for all 50 states and the largest cities.

The census bureau assured me that the tapes would be released by early Spring, 1993. I waited. And waited. And waited some more. In the Fall I was told that they were ready, and with a grant from the Bradley Foundation, I was able to buy the six CDs that contained the information. Progress! Not only were the CDs cheaper to buy than tapes, they were cheaper to run. And Brookings began to run them. Only to discover after several months that the code books were wrong. There was no such data on the 5% sample.

It was available on the "universe tapes," what one might think of as the "100% sample," numbering tens of millions of families, much too big for even the Brookings' computers, not to mention too bulky and expensive to handle. It was also available on the 2% sample, but this "n" was too small to be of use for a fine grained study. Call after call produced only a frustrating silence. Census did not plan to do another run. No matter that the code books said the information was there. Nor was there a refund for the worthless CDs.

Why didn't the CDs contain the necessary information? The numbers had never been run by Census. Why not? No one knew. Or at least no one who I talked to was telling. Was it information someone wanted to suppress? At this point, even the most cynical researcher should be forgiven such paranoid speculation. After all, even paranoids have enemies.

In any case, it looked very odd. Why would the 1990 information, of obvious interest -- information that existed on the universe tapes and the 2% sample, information that had been available from the 1980 census, albeit in limited form -- be suddenly and mysteriously unavailable?

I still have no idea. But Census could rerun the data to create my data set.

It struck me that there were two ways to get the information. Go to Congress or go to the Department of Education and ask that they firmly request the data. I did the latter, saving the former as a last resort. I called an old friend in the Department of Education who was both knowledgeable and honest. He sent me to a ranking civil servant in the National Center for Education Statistics who had once worked at Census. Through his good offices the Bureau of the Census agreed to do a special run. At a cost of $10,000! It took several weeks to agree to a format, and by mid-Fall, 1994, the numbers finally arrived, on three flexible computer discs and as more than 400 pages of printouts.

There is, no doubt, a moral to the story. But I am not sure exactly what it is. Surely these numbers are not dangerous. Suppressing them seems a bit far-fetched. Yet the difficulty in getting them was extraordinarily great, even by standards I have come to know only too well, both by virtue of my own time in the civil service and by virtue of using other federal data sets. No doubt the real answer is the prosaic, Kafkaesque one: bureaucratic sloth and indifference taken to Olympian levels.

The good news, of course, is that it is still possible to get things done. If you know where to go. Just like the public school teachers who chose private schools for their own children. And I suppose at one level, at least, that is the reassuring part of the story. Even the mountain of adamant known as the federal bureaucracy has a human face when you know where to look.

Denis P. Doyle
Chevy Chase MD
April 1995

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Where do public school teachers send their own children to school? Are they like chefs who prefer their own cuisine, or are they like the First Family, guardians of the public trust, who select a private school for the First Child? And if public schools are not "good enough" for many public school teachers -- and public servants like the First Family -- for whom are they good enough? At issue is the very nature of the policy process in a democracy. As no less an authority than Forrest Gump might say, policy is as policy does. What public school teachers do should be taken seriously.

Three strands of the national debate about education reform make the issue particularly important today: first and most important is our national commitment to both access and equity for the poor, for both moral and instrumental reasons; second is the spiraling crisis in values, revealed most poignantly in juvenile crime, violence, substance abuse, and teen-age pregnancy, and third is the recent interest in school reform, through such concepts as "privatization," the product of frantic school boards and for-profit providers who promise to do schools "better." How do these issues relate to the question of where teachers send their children to school?

First, the poor are excluded from fee-charging markets. And as we look at the nation's urban schools it becomes abundantly clear that they are once again what 19th century Governor Dewitt Clinton called schools for paupers. The poor are trapped in institutions few middle class Americans would tolerate for themselves. If private schools are good enough for teachers they might be good enough for poor children.

Second, public schools have been virtually stripped of moral content as education --- and behavior -- has become "value free." No longer do public schools support what every educator from Aristotle to Horace Mann accepted as fundamental: character formation. While private schools have never lost touch with this simple insight, public schools seem unable to grasp this elemental truth: education is more than knowing facts, it is knowing what to do about them.

Third, "privatization" is an issue for the simplest of reasons: in city after city, community after community, public schools are not working. Policy makers are desperate for solutions and entrepreneurs are eager to provide them. But it is not clear that a "new" source of private education has to be invented when an exemplary private resource already exists.

Look at the terms of the current debate. As usual, it is cast as "spending more money," not spending differently; Washington DC public schools are a case in point. Among the states, DC is one of the lowest performing school systems in the nation, at nearly $10 thousand per child it is the highest spending. It is a relatively resource rich school system, yet 51.6% of Washington's teachers who earn more than twice the median income enroll their children in private schools.

The debate about education "values," insofar as it is raised at all is cast in terms of hygiene rather than ethics -- condom distribution, for example, rather than character formation.

And the privatization debate is cast in terms of greater efficiency, of "doing" existing schools "better," as if that were the issue.

At one level, the argument about these issues is fundamentally disingenuous; there are already more than 26,000 private schools, each one of which has staked out its own values and makes no bones about it. And each one is in demand, not only by the parents of nearly five million children, but by the most discerning patrons in American education: professional teachers.

Nationally, teachers -- public and private -- are fifty percent more likely than the public at-large to choose private schools (17.1% to 13.1%). Yet public school teachers as a group choose private schools less often than the public at-large, by a one point margin 12.1% to 13.1%. Nationally, black public school teachers use private schools more than white teachers (12.9% to 11.9%) and fifty percent more likely than black parents in general

FIGURE 1: PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES	NOT HISPANIC	HISPANIC
ALL FAMILIES	13.1	14.2	8.1	10.8	13.4	10.1
ALL TEACHERS	17.1	17.5	14.2	15.9	17.1	18.7
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	12.1	11.9	12.9	13.6	11.9	16.5
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	32.7	33.9	20.3	24.7	32.9	27.0

(8.1%). Indeed, in 22 cities, black teachers are more likely than white teachers to use private schools. And there are statistical extremes as well:

although the number of black teachers in Honolulu is small, 100% of those surveyed reported that they use private schools.) Hispanic teachers use them more than non-Hispanic teachers (16.5% to 11.9%) and fifty percent more likely than Hispanic parents (10.1%).

But the truly interesting story unfolds in America's troubled cities. There, public school teachers are significantly more likely to enroll their children in private school. In Boston 44.6% do, in Cleveland 39.7%, in Grand Rapids 41.1% do. Controlling for income the figures are even more

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, BY INCOME, SELECTED CITIES

CITY	ALL	INCOME > $70 K
BATON ROUGE	35.7%	59.1%
BOSTON	44.6 %	65.8%
CHICAGO	36.3%	44.1%
CLEVELAND	39.7%	31.2%
DENVER	26.5%	50.2%
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1%	48.6%
JERSEY CITY	50.3%	61.1%
LOS ANGELES	30.1%	53.3%
NEW YORK	27.9%	33.4%
NEWARK	37.8%	61.4%
PITTSBURGH	35.4%	30.0%
PHILADELPHIA	35.9%	47.5%
RICHMOND	21.2%	26.7%
SAN FRANCISCO	36.7%	55.9%
SEATTLE	30.8%	39.1%
TOLEDO	35.8%	54.0%
WASHINGTON DC	28.2%	40.4%

striking: at twice the median income (a family income greater then $70,000 per year, a category in which teachers are twice as likely to fall as the public at-large, 26.6% to 13.3%) public school teachers are often three and even four times as likely as the public at-large to use private schools: Akron OH, 52.2%; Boston, 65.8%; Denver, 50.2%; Little Rock, 53.3%; Newark NJ, 61.4%; San Francisco, 55.9%; St. Louis, 55.8%; and, Toledo, 54.0%, though as Figure 2 reveals, the relationship is not fixed.

But the linkage of income to private school choice is more complex than it might at first appear. In 49 of the largest 100 cities, for example, a greater percent of middle income public school teachers use private schools than upper income private school teachers.

In this context, the question quite naturally arises: don't families who are better off use private schools in larger numbers than those who are less well off? They do indeed; but that is precisely the point. Private schooling represents a serious financial commitment, and existing public policy deliberately denies the poor access to it. Public and private pricing decisions simply exclude the poor; only private philanthropy ameliorates it. That is why -- in part -- other democracies such as Australia, Denmark and the Netherlands fund private schooling: to permit poor children to attend private schools. But they also fund private schooling because they recognize that education is a private as well as a public good and are convinced that choice among schools should be a democratic prerogative.

Not surprisingly, in the US, the most telling numbers are those for race and income.. In Chicago, for example, 63.0% of high income white public school teachers use private schools, while only 25.2% of blacks do (as it

happens, more middle income black public school teachers in Chicago use private schools than high income do). At the same time, in New York, middle income black and white public school teachers are equally likely to use private schools (26.7%), high income whites are more likely (35.0% to 27.8%) while in Philadelphia, 50.0% of high income white public school teachers use private schools while 46.6 % of blacks do.

How can teachers afford private schools? Compared to the competition, private school tuition's, on average, are much less much less than public school costs and teachers are relatively well-paid. For example, typical elementary private school tuitions are one-third public school expenditures: in 1990 the average private elementary school tuition was $1,780, the average public elementary school expenditure was $5,177. Similarly, the average private high school tuition was $4,395 while the average per pupil high school expenditure -- at $6,472 -- was fifty percent higher. The disparity is even more striking in Catholic schools which enroll 55% of all private school students. Average tuition in Catholic elementary schools in 1990 was $1,243, one fourth public school expenditures and Catholic high schools average $2,878, 44% of the average public expenditure for public high schools.

FIGURE 3: "COST" AND PRICE

	PUBLIC SCHOOL EXPENDITURES	PRIVATE SCHOOL TUITION	CATHOLIC SCHOOL TUITION
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	$5,177	$1,780	$1,243
SECONDARY SCHOOL	$6,472	$4,395	$2,878

As little as private schools charge -- at least as compared to public schools -- they still represent a significant financial challenge to all but the well-off.

Rare is the family that does not consider the impact of tuition on the family budget. The decision to attend private school is a serious one. How is it that teachers can afford private school? Contrary to the popular image, teacher families are reasonably well off. While slightly less than half (48.9%) of the nation's families with children earn less than $35 thousand per year, only 22% of public school teachers with children do, and while only 13.1% of the families with children earn more than twice the national norm -- $70 thousand a year or more -- nearly twice as many public school teachers do (25.1%). Significantly more teachers can afford private school than the public at-large.

Not to make too fine a point, teachers, public and private, white and black, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, low income, middle income and high income know how to address the nation's education crisis: they vote with their feet and their pocket books. They choose private schools for their children when they think it serves their best interest.

But if the education crisis the nation faces is not about doing old things better -- but about doing things differently -- the behavior of teachers presents a dramatic policy remedy, one that is readily available. Let low income Americans do what large numbers of American teachers do: attend private school.

Most Americans would agree that it is sensible, even wise, for government to pay collectively for the education of our children. But to do that must government own and operate the means of production? And it is clear that a government monopoly -- at least a monopoly for the poor -- helps those least who need help most: the poor.

Qualitatively better education is what private school patrons look for and that is what they find. Private schools believe in such things as character formation, high academic standards, safe and secure environments for teachers and taught, professional autonomy and a sense of efficacy for teachers, true racial integration, self respect and respect for others. Most important, they are communities of scholarship and shared moral and academic values. They are inclusive not exclusive institutions.

It was the great insight of an earlier Gov. Clinton to create "schools for paupers," the nation's first "public schools." It is a bitter irony that our urban schools have become schools for paupers once again, in large measure because of doctrinaire hostility to private education. Indeed, it is not too much to assert that private schools are the new common school.

The dismal conclusion one must draw from the evidence is that urban public schools -- as systems -- are about as popular as work houses in the 19th century or county hospitals in the 20th. By and large people use them because they must, not because they prefer them to the alternative.

And if teachers reject the institutions in which they teach and feel free to chose a private alternative, on what basis should the poor and dispossessed be denied? In no other area of the modern welfare state are the poor denied a service simply because they are poor; there is a profound irony in this because the guiding impulse of the welfare state is precisely to eliminate disparities in access occasioned by poverty.

Bluntly put, if private schools are good enough for the discerning and the well off why are they not "good enough" for the poor and dispossessed? Make no mistake; the poor do not have access to private schools because of

deliberate public policy decisions at all levels of government to deny them such access. It is not an accident. In medicine or other areas of public interest the issue is now open and shut. The poor house, the work house, the alms house have all virtually disappeared because of the wide spread belief that human dignity is enhanced by choice among providers.

The progressive tradition of the 20th century accounted it a great success that income inequalities could be smoothed over through redistributive social policies -- in outright income redistribution through the tax system and in the other legs of the human capital pyramid, health care and retirement, for example. In civilized societies, we take justifiable pride that the old are not forced into lives of abject poverty, that the ill and infirm have resources to meet their needs. Medicare beneficiaries are not forced into government run hospitals, nor are social security recipients required to spend their meager allotments in government commissaries. In the case of elementary and secondary education, however, governments funds are committed to institutions -- government owned and operated schools -- rather than students.

Indeed, it is not to much to assert that the last abused minority group in America are poor children whose families prefer religious education. It is simply not available except through charity and private beneficence, the one activity the modern welfare state was designed to render unnecessary.

Unhappily, the thoughtful economic arguments of thinkers like Milton Friedman have made little headway against what can only be described as reactionary liberalism. Perhaps it is time for a moral argument. Advance the debate not on instrumental or efficiency grounds, but simple human decency. That is the argument that has lead to choice in the other

democracies. Only America denies the poor the right to attend the religious -- or non-religious -- schools of their choice. Perhaps that is where the debate belongs. We should support school choice because it is the right thing to do.

Denis P. Doyle
Chevy Chase MD
May 1995

INTRODUCTION Where do public school teachers send their own children to school? Are they like chefs who prefer their own cuisine, or are they like the First Family, guardians of the public trust, who select a private school for the First Child? And if public schools are not "good enough" for many public school teachers -- and public servants like the First Family -- for whom are they good enough? [1] Put more neutrally, what is the significance of public school teachers -- and public officials generally -- sending their own children to private school?[2] At issue is the very nature of the policy process in a democracy; historically, in our pragmatic American context, practice has been policy. As no less an authority than Forest Gump might say, policy is as policy does. What public school teachers do, then, should be taken seriously.

---

1 This monograph is organized with a prefatory narrative that describes where the numbers come from (and why they took so long to get); a narrative that deals with some of the more pertinent policy issues and implications of the facts as they present themselves; a concluding narrative "summary of findings" that is too dense for all but the specialist; and 47 carefully crafted tables that are designed to bring the data to the reader in easy-to-use form. The full data set -- on three flexible discs, which print out to more than 450 pages -- is available form the bureau of the Census. See the inside back cover for ordering information.

The results reported here are a follow-on to an earlier study of 19890 data that was limited to 13 states and 25 cities; that was the extent of the data available and it permitted my co-author, Terry Hartle and me to prepare a short report, released in the Spring of 1986 by the American Enterprise Institute. This study demonstrates that the earlier work was not an aberration; public school teachers in urban areas enroll their children in private school at significantly higher rates than does the population at large.

2 That the issue is not restricted to teachers and the First Family was demonstrated quite forcefully in a recent Heritage Foundation study of where members of Congress send their children to school. They too, disproportionately choose private schools. Released in February, 1994, the study was based on a survey of members which found that 50% of Senate Republicans and 39.5% of Senate Democrats used private schools, more than three times the national average; consistent with its more egalitarian composition, fewer House members use private schools: 36% of House Republicans and 25.2% of House Democrats (only two and three times the national average). Two subsets of the data are specially interesting: 29.6% of members of the Black Caucus used private schools and 70% of the Hispanic Caucus did. For the full report, see "How Members of Congress Exercise School Choice," by Allyson M. Tucker and William F. Lauber, the Heritage Foundation, Washington DC, February 1, 1994.

Three strands of the national debate about education reform make the issue particularly important today: first and most important is our national commitment to both access and equity for the poor, for both moral and instrumental reasons[3]; second is the spiraling crisis in values, revealed most poignantly in juvenile crime, violence, substance abuse, and teen-age pregnancy, and, third is the recent interest in school "privatization," the product of for-profit providers who promise to do schools "better." How do these issues relate to the question of where teachers send their children to school?

- The poor -- by definition -- are excluded from fee-charging markets. And as we look at the nation's urban schools it becomes abundantly clear that they are once again (one hundred sixty years after DeWitte Clinton's Free School Society) schools for paupers. The poor are trapped in institutions few middle class American would tolerate for themselves. If private schools are good enough for teachers they might be good enough for poor children.
- Public schools have been virtually stripped of moral content as education -- and behavior -- has become "value free." No longer do public schools support what every educator from Aristotle to Horace Mann knew was fundamental: character formation. While private schools have never lost touch with this simple insight, public schools seem unable to grasp this

[3] Indeed, public schools as we know them today were invented by another, earlier Governor Clinton, DeWitte, of New York, who founded the "Free School Society" to receive private funds to educate the poor because of the perceived market failure of the day: private schools, good at educating those who could pay, did not reach many in great need of education, the poor. The Free School Society could not make it without public funds; not long after public funding was made available it became the "Public School Society" and quickly lost its private, voluntary character. A cautionary tale if ever there was one.

elemental truth: education is more than knowing facts, it is knowing what to do about them.

- For-profit "privatization" is an issue for the simplest of reasons: in city after city, community after community, public schools are not working. Policy makers are desperate for solutions and entrepreneurs are eager to provide them. But it is not clear that a "new" source of private education -- paid for with public funds -- has to be invented when an exemplary private resource already exists.

Insofar as private schools offer teachers something special, then, they speak directly to these three policy dimensions of the national education crisis.

This is as it should be, because most of the current debate about education is utterly sterile. It is a debate about incrementalism and technique, not fundamental change. What teachers do speaks volumes about education reform:

- The debate about poor children is cast as "spending more money," not spending differently; Washington DC public schools are a case in point. One of the lowest performing school districts in the nation, at nearly $10 thousand per child it is the highest spending. Yet 51.6% of Washington's teachers who earn more than twice the median income enroll their children in private schools; [4]
- The debate about education "values," insofar as it is raised at all is cast in terms of hygiene rather than ethics -- condom distribution, for example, rather than character formation; in city after city, America's public school

[4] See Table 39.

teachers are sending their own children to religiously affiliated schools; and

- The privatization debate is cast in terms of greater efficiency, of "doing" existing schools "better," as if that were the issue. Existing private schools already do it better.

Indeed, the debate about each of these issues is fundamentally disingenuous; there are already more than 26,000 private schools, each one of which faces a market test every day.[5] Each has staked out its own values and makes no bones about it. And each is in demand, not only by the parents of nearly five million children, but by the most discerning patrons in American education: professional teachers.

WHERE TEACHERS SEND THEIR OWN CHILDREN

Nationally, teachers are half again as likely as the public at-large to chose private schools (17.1% to 13.1%),[6] in America's troubled cities public school teachers are two and three times as likely as the public at-large to use private schools.[7] In extreme cases they are four and five times as likely to use private schools. Nationally, black public school teachers use private schools more than white teachers (12.9% to 11.9%) and Hispanic teachers use them more than non-Hispanic teachers (16.5% to 11.9%).[8]

Not to make too fine a point, teachers, public and private, white and black, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, low income, middle income and high income know how to address the nation's education crisis: they vote with their feet

---

[5] See Table 1.
[6] See Table 10.
[7] See Table 42.
[8] See Table 28.

and their pocket books. They chose private schools for their children when they think it serves their best interest.

Indeed, in 19 states and DC public school teachers are more likely than the public to use private schools.[9]

Yet across the nation, public school teachers as a group chose private schools less often than the public at-large by a one point margin, 12.1% to 13.1%,[10] precisely what one would expect. It is when the going gets tough that teachers make the decision to abandon the institutions in which they work and enroll their own offspring in private schools. And they do so in the face of both high cost and professional disapprobation. They must overcome any internal reluctance they may feel about patronizing the competition as well as the slings and arrows of critics.

But if the education crisis the nation faces is not about doing old things better -- but about doing things differently -- the behavior of teachers presents a dramatic policy remedy, one that is readily available. Let Americans at-large do what large numbers of American teachers do: attend private school. And if not Americans at-large, at least extend the option to those who need it most, low income Americans.

It is clear to most Americans that "more of the same" is futile. Yet the simplest and most direct way to end the "more of the same" mind set would be to end the "exclusive franchise" that public schools now enjoy.[11] Most

---

[9] See Table 11.
[10] See Table 10.

[11] Ted Kolderie of the University of Minnesota's Humphry Institute should be credited with this evocative coinage. He has spoken and written widely about it.

Americans would agree that it is sensible, even wise, for government to pay for the education of our children. But to do that must government own and operate the means of production? And it is clear that a government monopoly -- at least a monopoly for the poor -- is relentlessly ordinary, even harmful to their best interests.

Qualitatively different education is what private school patrons look for and it is what they find. Private schools are not a parallel system, the photographic negative, as it were, of public schools; they are very different institutions. They believe in such things as character formation, academic content, safe and secure environments for teachers and taught, professional autonomy and a sense of efficacy for teachers, true racial integration, self respect and respect for others. Most important, they are communities of scholarship and shared moral and academic values. They are inclusive not exclusive institutions. Indeed, it is not too much to assert that private schools are the new common school.

The fact that so many teachers choose private school for their own children is all the more interesting in light of what teaching is all about. Teaching is a helping profession. Teachers are compassionate and cooperative, not competetive. They are following a "vocation," teaching because it is a good thing to do. Not because of the money. Finally, they are members of the most heavily unionized workforce in the nation. And their unions -- the large National Education Association and the smaller American Federation of Teachers -- are ardently opposed to private education.

Or more precisely, they are ardently opposed to public funding of any form of private education. They oppose vouchers, tax credits, "parochaid," and contract management of schools -- indeed they oppose "privatization" with a

fervor ordinarily reserved for the most intense ideological battles. But that, of course, is precisely what it is: ideological. It is not opposition to the instrumental effect of private schools; even the obdurate special interest group leader must admit that private schools do a good job. If nothing else they must earn their tuitions in a market so heavily stacked against them that it is a wonder they survive at all.

Public school interest groups are opposed to aid to non-public schools because they are genuinely convinced that such a development would mean the "ruin" of public education. How can a massive industry, commanding public expenditures approaching one quarter trillion dollars a year, employing 2.5 million teachers and educating (if that is the word for it) more than 40 million youngsters annually seriously suppose that aid to non-public schools would ruin them? They so suppose because it might be true.

It is possible that all that holds the vast system together is compulsion. The monopolist's worse fear, of course, is competition. Indeed, in the private sector monopolies can only exist if they enjoy the active support of the state. As Peter Drucker points out, monopolies create a "price umbrella" which alert providers can first work under, then defeat. The monopolist's artificially high prices provide price protection for the fledgling entrepreneur. As the novice gains experience, he can go toe-to-toe with the monopolist. Unless the state sanctions unfair practices the monopolist's inefficiencies are eventually revealed, and the more efficient producer can sweep him aside. It may take time. It certainly takes energy. And it takes vision. But it happens. Perhaps the teacher's unions know this. But if their own members, on average, patronize public schools in larger numbers than the public at large what have they to fear?

What they fear, of course, is the fine grained numbers. What do public school teachers do when they are confronted with terrible schools? As we have already noted, at the state level, the numbers are revealing; in 19 states, public school teachers enroll their children in private schools in greater numbers than the public at large.[12] And in three jurisdictions -- Hawaii, Delaware and Washington DC -- 60% or more of private school teachers select private schools for their children. [13] But that is to be expected. Interestingly, among the public at large, the highest private school enrollment in the nation is now Hawaii (21.4%), which only recently edged into the lead. [14] Historically, private school enrollment correlated with Catholic population; accordingly, it is interesting to speculate about the impact of Hawaii's state-wide school system, the only state in the nation so graced. Perhaps that is to be expected as well.

But states are only a part of the story.

What is more interesting is private school enrollment by city. In 33 of the nation's largest cities more than half the private school teachers choose private school while in 15 cities more than 60% do; [15] in 43 cities, more than one fifth of public school teachers choose private school and in 32 cities, more than one quarter of public school teachers choose private school -- roughly half again and twice the national average, respectively.[16] In fifteen cities, more than 40% of public school teachers select private schools, more than three times the national average.[17]

---

[12] See Table 14.
[13] See Table 10.
[14] See Table 10.
[15] See Table 24.
[16] See Table 19.
[17] See Table 21.

Race and ethnicity tell an equally interesting story: white teachers are about one-third less likely to select private schools than the population at-large (11.9% to 14.2%)[18]; of all black families, 8.1% choose private schools; half again as many black public school teachers do (12.9%). So too Hispanic teachers; they select private schools more than half again as often as Hispanics generally (16.5% to 10.1%).[19] And in 22 cities, more black than white teachers enroll their children in private school; in Hawaii, 100% of black public school teacher respondents reported that they enrolled their children in private school (more than twice the number of white teachers who do).[20] Yet in 7 cities, one-half or more of the white public school teachers use private schools (even though, nationally, white public school teachers are less likely than the public at large to use private schools.)[21]

Not surprisingly, the more telling numbers relate to income. Low income families are significantly less likely to use private school; low income teachers, as a group, are almost twice as likely to use private schools (15.8% to 8.4%). Indeed, income is only a weak predictor of teacher behavior for private school teachers; they use private schools in almost the same proportion regardless of income (32.2%, 31.7% and 35.5%), while income does predict public school teacher behavior (9.8%, 11.6%, 15.2%). [22]

In fourteen of the nation's largest cities, more than half the public school teachers who earn twice the median income choose private schools, more than three times the national average for public school teachers and in fifteen cities more than thirty percent do, twice the national average.[23] But the

---

[18] See Table 28.
[19] See Table 28.
[20] See Table 36.
[21] See Table 35.
[22] See Table 37.
[23] See Table 44.

linkage of income to private school choice is more complex than it might at first appear. In 49 of the largest 100 cities, for example, a greater percent of middle income public school teachers use private schools than upper income private school teachers.[24]

The most telling numbers, of course, are those for race and income together. While middle and high income blacks are more likely to use private schools than middle and high income whites (13.7% to 11.35 and 20.5% to 14.5%), the greatest percent of public school teachers who use private schools is high income whites in selected cities.[25] In Chicago, for example, 63.0% of high income white public school teachers use private schools, while only 25.2% of blacks do (as it happens, more middle income black public school teachers in Chicago use private schools than high income do). At the same time, in New York, middle income black and white public school teachers are equally likely to use private schools (26.7%), high income whites are more likely (35.0% to 27.8%). In Philadelphia, 50.0% of high income white public school teachers patronize private school while 46.6 % of blacks do.[26]

THE PRICE OF QUALITY

The issue is all the more interesting because of an anomaly about which few Americans are aware. Typical elementary private school tuition charges are less than typical public school expenditures, by a margin of three to one. In 1990 for example, the average private elementary school tuition in the US was $1,780, one third the average public elementary school expenditure of $5,177. Similarly, the average private high school tuition was $4,395 while the average pupil high school

---

[24] See Table 45.
[25] See Table 46.
[26] See Table 40.

expenditure -- at $6,472 -- was half again as much. [27] Looking more closely at the numbers, the disparity is even more striking; of all private school students, 55% attend Catholic schools, where tuitions are significantly below the private school average. Catholic elementary schools, for example, average tuition charges of $1,243, one fourth public school expenditures and Catholic high schools average $2,878, 44% of the average public expenditure for public high schools.[28]

An additional anomaly has to do with school size; for decades public school administrators have argued that larger schools offer economies of scale; as a consequence, public schools are much larger than private schools across the board.[29] While one quarter of private schools enroll fewer than 50 students, only 3.1% of public schools do; at the same time, nearly 70% of public schools enroll more than 300 students, while only 19% of private schools do.[30]

---

[27] See Tables 2, 3 and 4, including footnotes.

[28] There is, to be sure, a comparability problem between private school tuitions (or charges, which are not the same as costs) and public school expenditures (which are not the same as costs). Tuitions understate cost because of subsidies, but so too public school expenditures understate cost because of irregularities and incomplete reporting. For example, in most jurisdictions capital costs are not included in per pupil expenditure costs; neither are teacher retirement costs, leading some analysts to conclude that per pupil public school expenditures may understate true cost by as much as 20%. Unfortunately, these are the only data we have and perforce, must do. Or as we say in Washington, "the data are good enough for government work."

[29] For example, in the 1930s when the population was half what it is today (less that 130 million people) there were more than 130,000 school districts; today, with 260 million Americans there are 15,025 school districts. Even more telling is the number of high schools; in 1930 there were 23,930 high schools for a total US population of 123 million people; in 1990 there were 22,791 high schools for a total population of 248 million. Public schools have succumbed to gigantism. How did it happen, one wonders, when any responsible adult knows that without exception smaller numbers of teenagers are to be preferred to larger numbers.

[30] See Table 5.

Private schools are chosen by their patrons, then, not because they are large and resource rich -- to the contrary, the vast majority are small and relatively resource poor. Private schools offer something more important: quality education. There are, to be sure, expensive private schools. But their numbers are few, principally the well-known day and boarding schools of New England and the nation's major metropolitan areas. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), the membership organization that represent them, has fewer than 1,500 members out a national total of more than 26,000 private schools.

All members of NAIS report that in 1990-91 average elementary tuitions were $4,066 and average high school expenditures were $7,306. [31] Four jurisdictions reported higher per pupil expenditures (not just high school, which school districts do not report to NCS): Alaska, $8,450; Washington DC, $9,549; New Jersey, $9,317; and, New York, $8,527. But state-wide spending does not begin to capture the range among districts. High spending public schools -- Pocantico Hills NY, the North Carolina School for Science and Mathematics (one of the few public boarding schools in the nation), or Bloomfield Hills MI, for example -- spend as much or more than the most elite private school.

As little as private schools charge -- at least as compared to the public school competition -- they still represent a significant financial challenge to all but the well off. Rare is the family that does not consider the impact of tuition on the family budget. The decision to attend private school is a serious one. How is it that teachers can afford private school? Contrary to the popular image, teacher families are reasonably well off. While slightly less than half

---

[31] See Table 4.

(48.9%) of the nation's families with children earn less than $35 thousand per year, only 22% of public school teachers with children do, and while only 13.1% of the families with children earn more than twice the national norm -- $70 thousand a year or more -- nearly twice as many public school teachers do (25.1%).[32] Significantly more teachers can afford private school than the public at-large.

Another curious dimension of private schools is the issue of salaries. Private school teachers, across the board, are paid less than public school teachers in the same labor markets. Unlike the other learned professions -- law, architecture, medicine, accounting -- teachers "discount" their income to work in the private sector. Why? They are willing to work for less because they prefer what the job offers. It is widely known that "working conditions" and the nature of work affect employee attitudes toward work -- hard rock miners, for example, when offered an increase in wages are likely to work fewer hours to gain additional time above ground. It is equally the case that "psychic" income is a critically important component of total income, particularly for professionals. Indeed, working "better" for less is a well-established practice, seen most vividly in teaching hospitals, among astronauts and high performance pilots, Supreme Court judges, the White House staff, public defenders, and, of course, college professors. Dedicated people take a cut in income to do good. So too private school teachers.

Private schools, then, are preferred by teachers, not just as a place to send their children, but as a place to work.

---

[32] See Tables 37 and 38.

THE POOR AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS In this context, one central question demands an answer: If private schools are good enough for the discerning and the well off why are they not "good enough" for the poor and dispossessed? Make no mistake; the poor do not have access to private schools because of deliberate policy decisions at all levels of government denying them such access. It is not an accident. In medicine or other areas of public interest the issue is now open and shut. The poor house, the work house, the charity hospital, the alms house have all virtually disappeared because of the wide spread belief that human dignity is enhanced by choice among providers.

More to the point, the great progressive tradition of the 20th century accounted it a great success that income inequalities could be smoothed over through redistributive social policies -- in outright income redistribution through the tax system and in the other legs of the human capital stool, health care and retirement, for example. In civilized societies, there is justifiable pride that the old are not forced into lives of abject poverty, that the ill and infirm have resources to meet their needs. Medicare beneficiaries are not forced into government run hospitals, nor are social security recipients required to spend their meager allotments in government commissaries. In the case of elementary and secondary education, however, government funds are committed to institutions -- government owned and operated schools -- rather than students.

Indeed, it is not to much to assert that the last unserved minority group in America are poor children whose families prefer religious education. It is simply not available except through charity and private beneficence, the one

activity the modern welfare state was designed to render unnecessary. [33] Imagine denying Medicare recipients the right to seek medical care in a Jewish, Lutheran or Catholic hospital because of its religious character. Indeed, one is moved to ask what the state interest is in denying such children access to religious schools. Was John Stuart Mill right when he said that state sponsored schooling is:

> a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation, in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind ...[34]

The "great liberator," Simon Bolivar's insight is compelling:

> Let us give to our republic a fourth power with authority over the youth, the hearts of men, public spirit, habits and republican morality. Let us establish this Areopagus to watch over the education of the children ... to purify whatever may be corrupt in the republic, to denounce ingratitude, coldness in the country's service, egotism, sloth, idleness, and to pass judgment upon the first signs of corruption and pernicious example.[35]

By way of contrast, at the national level, U.S. higher education policy favors the individual, not the institution. Grants and loans go to students, not schools. [36] Is it more than coincidence that American elementary and

---

[33] For a compelling normative statement about why children should have the right to choose religious (as well as non-religious) schools, see John E. Coons and Stephen D. Sugarman, *Education by Choice: The Case for Family Control* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) and their subsequent articles and books.

[34] Quoted in Stephen Aarons, *Compelling belief: The Culture of American Schooling* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 19983) p 195.

[35] Simon Bolivar, from his address to the Congress of Angostura, Feb. 5, 1819.

[36] The issue was hammered out in the Johnson White House in the early days of the great Society. And while the decision to make elementary and secondary education "school based programs" was made early, the vote in the Congress hinged on the willingness of the White House to include private schools in the funding formulas. Until *Aguilar*, (1985) the US government let Title 1 funds flow to parochial schools. Thus, in a

secondary education is in deep trouble while American higher education is still the envy of the world?

The question has international resonance, for ours is the only advanced nation that does not provide public funds for children to attend private schools. In America, private schools are only available to families with the resources to attend them. In a society which values equality as much as it values liberty the dilemma is a distressing one.[37]

Australian practice is a case in point. As continental democracies, not only do we share common law traditions, a similar colonial heritage, a common language, and a frontier legacy, our political and cultural circumstances are very much alike. Indeed, the framers of the Australian Constitution adopted much of our constitutional language, word-for-word, including our First Amendment. But unlike our Supreme Court, the Australian High Court has inclined toward the "free exercise clause" and has ruled that so long as the state supports all religious schools equally (including irreligious schools) and

---

consummate irony, federal aid to education generally was made possible by aid to religious schools. The public schools had a short memory, however; none filed an *amicus* brief on behalf of private schools when *Aguilar* was heard.

The issue is additionally ironic in light of a similar story concerning the creation of the Department of Education. President Carter had promised the NEA that he would create a cabinet level department of education; he couldn't get the votes in the House, and as a condition of gaining support had to promise a small group of big city Democrats that he would create a non-statutory position of assistant secretary for non-public education. He made the promise -- in writing -- got the votes, and the Department was created. Carter then appointed the non-statutory assistant secretary. His position was the first victim of President Reagan's budget cutters after his victory; because the position had been established by executive order, it could be cut. Another cautionary tale.

[37] For a more detailed discussion of this issue see Denis P. Doyle, "Family Choice in Education: The Case of Denmark, Holland and Australia," in *Private Schools and Public Policy: International Perspectives,* eds., William Lowe Boyd & James G. Cibulka, The Falmer Press, NY, 1989.

prefers none to the other, the wall of separation between church and state are not violated.[38]

Australian support for families to attend private schools has an interesting history, orchestrated by a people's padre, Father James Carrol of Sydney (later Bishop Carrol, he died only this year). Convinced that poor Catholics could not afford a high quality education, Father Carroll campaigned energetically for public funding, convincing the Australian Labour party (the analogue of our Democratic party) to support the program. The result is an ingenious and effective system, in which poor children who attend low wealth schools enjoy fairly generous stipends, while wealthy children in high wealth schools receive only a nominal amount.

ANTI-CATHOLICISM AS PUBLIC POLICY

Few Americans are aware -- and fewer yet are prepared to admit it -- but the notion of "separation of church and state" to justify excluding private schools is largely anti-Catholic in origin. The phrase has near mythic implications in modern America, but as a device to deny funding to private schools its roots are ignoble. (Its legitimate roots -- from Jefferson -- were to prevent the national government from establishing a state religion, not prohibit children from attending religiously affiliated school, a wide-spread practice in the e arly half of the nineteenth century). Yet for the past fifty years, the courts have held that the "establishment" clause -- prohibiting the establishment of religion -- takes precedence over the free exercise clause -- which guarantees the free exercise of religion.

---

[38] *Ibid.*

To be sure, thanks to *Pierce v Society of Sisters,*[39] no American may be denied the legal right to attend a religious school (the practice *Pierce* forbade), but as a practical matter the poor are denied an opportunity to attend private schools unless they enjoy the beneficence of private benefactors.[40]

The effect is quite dramatic, as the framers of the policy meant it to be -- Catholic schools are forced to be self supporting. As indeed all other religious schools are, but they too bear the burden of the anti-Catholic sentiment that led to the prohibition of aid to students who attend private schools. Until the late 1840s, the states of New England supported two kinds of public schools, Protestant and what were euphemistically called "Irish schools." Both types of schools required students to engage in devotional activities -- public prayer and Bible reading -- but the Protestant schools used the King James version of the Bible, while the Catholics used the Douay version. Not satisfied with the literary excellence of the King James version, Protestant dominated legislatures began to systematically disenfranchise "Irish schools," just as they had enfranchised them earlier. The nation was overcome by an unseemly nativism, a source of shame today. Indeed, Protestant devotional activities -- school prayer and bible reading -- continued without Constitutional impediment until 1962 when it was struck down by the Court.[41]

---

[39] *Pierce v. Society of Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary* (No 583), Supreme Court of the United States, Oct. Term, 1924. "A suit to enjoin threatened enforcement of a stature requiring all children to attend public schools ..."

[40] For a more complete discussion of this issue see *Separation of Church and Child: The Constitution and Federal Aid to Religious Schools*, Thomas Vitullo-Martin and Bruce Cooper, with a foreword by Denis P. Doyle, Hudson Institute, Indianapolis IN, 1987.

[41] But that too, is honored in the breech, as anyone who has attended a school board meeting south of the Mason Dixon line knows

Indeed, so sure were the legislatures and courts of the day that the practice of funding religious schools was legal -- to either enfranchise or disenfranchise them as they saw fit -- that no legal issues were thought to be involved. Not only was there was no presumption of unconstitutionality, there was a presumption of constitutionality. It fell to Congressman James G. Blaine, (R, ME) a colleague and friend of President Grant, who served in the US House from 1863 to 1876, to propose an amendment to the US constitution that would forever bar the "Popish" practice of providing aid to Catholic schools. Convinced of the necessity of protecting the young nation from foreign influences, the amendment -- never enacted at the national level -- was enacted in state after state, effectively eliminating aid to parochial schools. To this day.[42]

California's is typical:

> No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools, not shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction therein be permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of this state.[43]

The overt anti-Catholicism embedded in this and similar Blaine Amendments in other states presents an extraordinary irony. Our first settlers were religious dissidents, and the US was not hostile to religious differences at the time of the Founding. To the contrary, the Northwest Ordinance had made available gifts of land for religious schools and the first schools in the original 13 colonies were denominational, and enjoyed public funding.

---

[42] For a spirited discussion of this subject, see Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "Government and the Ruin of Private Education," *Harpers*, April, 1978, pp. 28-38.

[43] California State Constitution, Article IX, Section 8.

In fact, the architects of the modern public school system, people like Horace Mann, were themselves deeply religious and saw the new "common school" as fulfilling religious -- though interdenominational -- functions. Robust Unitarian-Universalists, they were convinced that schools must provide a moral uplift, which was best achieved by an ecumenical Protestantism.

In the modern era, of course, separation of church and state is offered as a principled reason for not aiding families who want to send their children to private school, yet the roots of the practice are as poisonous as any civil right's affront of the 1980s or 90s. Imagine framing a social policy in starkly anti-Catholic terms today. Indeed, the old saw springs to mind: anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of intellectuals. And it is for this reason in particular that the habits of public school teachers are most interesting, for the major "supplier" of private education in the United States is the Catholic church.

Catholic schools still make up more than half the private schools in the country -- enrolling 55% of the nation's private school students -- even though they are a declining share of the total. [44] In 1930, Catholic schools enrolled 2.4 million youngsters, out of a school age population of approximately 26 million; today they still enroll 2.4 million youngsters, but by 1990 the population of school age youngsters was about 47 million. The high point of Catholic school enrollment was 1960, when 5.2 million students were enrolled (out of a school age population of 36 million); the numbers have fallen steadily ever since.[45]

---

[44] See Table 2.

[45] *Digest of Education Statistics, 1994, NCES 94-115*, p. 72.

The reasons for their decline are instructive. Catholic schools were among the most important socializing influences in the history of the republic. Indeed, in many respects they were more effective in assimilation than the melting pot character so often attributed to public schools (which, at least until the early 20th century attempted to Americanize their students.) Catholic schools offered a safe haven for the immigrant and for immigrant families, providing a sense of familiarity, continuity and belonging in a confusing and often dangerous environment. Catholic schools acted as a buffer to the harsh realties of industrializing America, a mediating structure that stood between the individual and the atomizing effects of unbridled free enterprise and growing anti-Catholic sentiment. Indeed, no less august a social critic than Christopher Jencks has argued that the Catholic school model is precisely what could help inner city blacks as they make their way in a forbidding urban environment.[46]

Catholic schools, then, effectively fulfilled -- and fulfill -- a public function, just as government schools do, yet it is only with government funding that they can be expected to maintain large enrollments over time. Ironically, they can exist in large numbers without government funding only so long as their sense of isolation from the larger society is intense. As Catholics feel less isolated their schools can remain as large scale providers of education only if public funds are made available for families to patronize them. A corresponding irony is that as Catholic schools became fewer in number, they became less "Catholic" in membership.[47] Catholic schools many of which

---

[46] See Christopher Jencks, "Catholic Schools for Black Children? *The New York Times Magazine*, November 1, 1968.

[47] Historically, religious schools have expected students and their families (as well as teachers) to be co-religionists. No longer. Catholic schools now report that only 24% request information about religious affiliation as a condition of enrollment, and most other parochial schools behave in the same way.

enroll a majority of urban non-Catholic students, have become the "affordable" alternative school.

As their graduates moved from manual to white collar work and found themselves free to move from their teeming ghettoes.

After the second world war, as America began to suburbanize, the nation's Catholic Bishops decided not to underwrite the funding of a new network of Catholic schools outside the central cities where they had flourished for a century. The cost implications were daunting, but more to the point, anti-Catholicism was slowly ebbing. By the time Jack Kennedy was elected it had passed its historic high water mark. To put the issue in quintessentailly American terms, by the 1960s the hyphenation was reversing; no longer Catholic-Americans, they were becoming American-Catholics. As Catholics moved to the suburbs in large numbers, not surprisingly enrollments began to plummet.

At the same time, however, total private school enrollment was climbing, from 10.7 percent in 1979 to 12.4 percent in 1985 [48]; which is to say, non-Catholic private school enrollments were increasing. Part of the growth was found in non-denominational schools, but the vast majority was in old main-line denominations and among religious groups that had historically not been major players, Conservative and Orthodox Jews and Eastern Rite Christians such as Greek and Armenian Orthodox schools.

---

[48] *Private Schools in the United States: A Statistical Profile, With Comparisons to Public Schools, NCES 91-054*, p 32.

The sharp decline in Catholic schools masked the increases in other areas: under counting of new schools and home schoolers, an under count that continues to this day. In many jurisdictions home schoolers are simply not counted by the authorities, either because they do no make the effort, or as is commonly the case, home schoolers do not identify themselves because they do not want to be counted.[49]

But the most important phenomenon associated with Catholic school decline was its effect on shrinking the pool of low cost private education for the poor. Indeed, until the late 1940s Catholic schools were, by and large, supported from the collection plate, but increasing costs, a declining number of religious teachers, and higher salary demands from lay teachers meant that Catholic schools began to charge tuition. And it was the "deductibility" of tuition payments from federal income tax that sparked the first major law suits about church state separation. While it was -- and is -- constitutional to deduct voluntary contributions, the courts found that tuition payments were not deductible because they were not voluntary.

But if American school policy was based on the public's desire to minimize Catholic education, its impact was felt by private schools generally.

PRIVATE SCHOOLS In the fall of 1990 there were 26,712 private elementary and secondary schools in the US enrolling 4.9 million students, (contrasted to 89,000 public schools which enroll 42 million students); 53

[49] From a research perspective, this raises interesting questions and problems. In some cases it is necessary to rely upon Bureau of the Census data as well as NCES data (or instead of it, for that matter.) Indeed, some NCES publications thoughtfully publish both data sets as in *Private Schools in the United States: A Statistical Profile, With Comparison to Public Schools NCES 91-054*. For example, see Table 3-5, p 33, which compares private school enrollments from both sources.

per cent enrolled in Catholic, 32 per cent in other religious and 15 per cent in nonsectarian schools. To provide a sense of scale, about $25 billion of the total national expenditure of nearly $250 billion on elementary and secondary education is for private schools. Indeed, a good rule of thumb when thinking about private school numbers is that they represent about ten percent of public school numbers.[50]

Why do students -- and their parents -- opt for private schools despite the extra -- and very real -- financial burden? Beyond the statistics, what is the appeal of private schools? What are private schools really like?

Unlike public schools -- which exhibit an astonishing "sameness" -- private schools vary widely, from religious schools of all denominations to military schools; from "free" schools to highly structured schools; from boarding schools to day schools; from academic schools to vocational schools; from special education to other "special" needs schools. In short, the variety that characterizes American elementary and secondary education is almost exclusively found in the private sector.

And contrary to popular opinion, private schools are not exclusively or even largely elite, high tuition institutions. To be sure there are some private schools that fit that description, but only a tiny handful. The nation's most prestigious private schools -- those that occupy a place in the American consciousness -- Choate, Exeter, Deerfield, St. Albans, Sidwell Friends, Dalton, St. Pauls -- while distinguished, enroll a small number of students overall and they pride themselves on their diversity. All are racially and socioeconomically integrated, at rates that significantly exceed those found in

[50] See Tables 1,2 and 3.

elite public schools. And their membership organization -- The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) -- includes fewer than fifteen hundred schools, and many of those are not high tuition institutions.

Also contrary to public opinion -- that they may ruthlessly exclude students, getting rid of trouble makers and deny admission to undesirables -- the vast majority of these schools are "inclusive" organizations, open to their parishioners, communicants and coreligonists. And insofar as they have space available, they are ready and willing to accept members of other faiths. This, of course, is true of the well-to-do private schools as well; by and large they are more open and inclusive than their public counterparts. At the high school level, for example, almost all private schools are functionally "magnet schools," that is, they have distinctive education philosophies which they communicate to their members and have no "geographic" attendance boundaries.

St. Anslem's Abbey school in North East Washington DC, for example, attracts students from as far away as Reston VA, and Gonzaga High School in downtown Washington enrolls day students from as far away as Baltimore. That pattern is repeated across the country. Indeed, only parish elementary schools are organized on the basis of neighborhood attendance, and that for convenience, not ideology. Excess capacity is made available to non-neighborhood students.

For obvious reasons, the major provider of private education in this country, as it is in other parts of the world, is religious institutions, enrolling 87% of the total.[51] They have the motive, the opportunity and the means: the motive,

[51] See Table 2.

of course, is the abiding conviction that education and values cannot and should not be separated; the opportunity is the administrative, organizational and physical capacity to offer schooling; and the means, at least in America, is tuition.

We take the latter so much for granted that it is worth special note. Fee charging schools, at both the elementary, secondary and post secondary level are almost an American exclusive. While they exist in a few developing countries such as the Philippines and parts of Africa, fee charging schools at any level are almost unknown in the developed nations. The most notable exceptions are the famous "public schools" of England (most of which enjoy substantial endowments). For the rest of the education system, the government picks up the tab, at all levels and without respect to religious denomination. In fact, public support of religiously oriented elementary and secondary schools is the norm throughout the world, excepting only America.[52]

The significance of the fee charging school in America is that it provides an opportunity for families of means to "buy" the education they think best serves their families' interests. The option is not available in the other developed nations; at the elementary and secondary level, of course, it is not needed since the several governments meet the costs of religious education. Most striking is the fact that it is not available abroad for post secondary education either. Fee charging schools at the post-secondary level are virtually unknown. From an economic standpoint it is quite remarkable.

---

[52] See Denis P. Doyle, "Developing Human Capital: The Role of the Private Sector," in *Theory Into Practice*, vol. 33, no 4, The Ohio State University, Fall, 1994 and *American Higher Education: Understanding the Puzzle*. Monograph. Council for International Exchange Scholars, 1987, Washington DC.

Young adults who might otherwise seek higher education can do so only in state institutions.[53]

Finally, there is the matter of racial isolation in the nation's schools, public and private. About one-fifth of public and private schools have minority enrollments of 50 percent or more, and 46 percent of public schools and 39 percent of private schools had less than five percent minority enrollment. Most important is the finding of James Coleman and his colleagues in 1982 (using data from High School and Beyond) that "blacks and whites are substantially less segregated in the private sector than in the public sector ... and in the Catholic sector the internal segregation ... is less that that in the public sector -- substantially so for blacks and whites, slightly less for Hispanics and Anglos." [54]

The dismal conclusion one must draw from the evidence is that urban public schools -- as systems -- are about as popular as work houses in the 19th century, or county hospitals in the 20th. By and large people use them because they must, not because they prefer them to the alternative.

The policy issue this raises was sharply cast in a colloquy between reporter John Merrill -- then of MacNeil-Lehrer news -- and former NY City

---

[53] This idea is more fully developed in Denis P. Doyle, *Innocents at Home: American Students and Overseas Study* (American Institute for Foreign Study Foundation: Washington DC, July 1994). The economic impact is quite dramatic; with one-third of the world's supply of higher education (and the center of an emerging "global culture") the United States "sells" higher education like hot cakes. Half a million foreign students -- full pay students, by and large -- study in the US at any point in time, while 71,000 Americans study abroad (the last date for which there is an accurate count). Foreign students, then, are an important source of foreign exchange earning for the US more than $7.5 billion per year.

[54] Quoted in, *NCES 91-054, ibid.*, p. 26.

Associate Superintendent Sy Fliegel. Why, he asked, did Fliegel favor school choice. Fliegel responded: "What's good enough for rich kids is good enough for poor kids." If private schools are good enough for public school teachers, why aren't they good enough for poor children? Why indeed.

IMPLICATIONS No matter how one examines the data, teachers and their organizations owe the public an answer to this question: if they reject the institutions they are teaching in and feel free to choose a private alternative, on what basis should the poor and dispossessed be denied this option? In no other area of the modern welfare state are the poor denied a service simply because they are poor; to the contrary, the guiding impulse of the welfare state is precisely to eliminate disparities in access occasioned by poverty.

Having said this, in examining what teachers do -- particularly as one tries to tease out policy implications -- one must resist the temptation to moralize. It would be uncharitable, for example, to think of them as hypocrites. Teachers are like the rest of us, living complicated lives, making difficult decisions under conditions of uncertainty, and generally trying to do the best they can. Particularly as regards their own children. And as the data shows there is no simple answer to what they do. Although the trends are pronounced, different teachers behave differently in different circumstances. As we have already noted, for example, black public school teachers are more likely to use private schools than white public school teachers. In the extreme case, Hawaii, one hundred percent of black teachers -- the entire sample -- use private schools.

But one thing is abundantly clear. The "worse" the public schools (and the more you know and can do about it) the greater the likelihood of enrolling in private school. In particular, urban teachers' behavior tells us that the more you know the less likely you are to use public schools.

That teachers prefer private schools drives home arguments about choice, not in terms of competition, but in terms of its ethical and normative dimension. With teachers choosing private schools, the truth is self-evident: while they work in public schools they choose private schools for their own children because they believe they are better. They are connoisseurs. And no one in our society is better qualified to make that judgment than teachers.

To public school teachers -- to the public at-large -- the public school is no longer a temple of civic virtue that demands unquestioning allegiance. That is why school districts across the country are exploring "privatization." To more and more teachers, teaching is a job and school is a business; if schools were able to exert some compelling claim on our loyalty -- if, for example, they were superb instruments for forging a democratic society, inculcating habits of prudence and civic virtue -- we could argue that teachers <u>should</u> send their children to public school. Indeed, teachers themselves would so argue, as they have in the past. The fact is that teachers who actually make the decision to enroll their children in private school are overcoming a strong professional push to the contrary.

We are left, then, with a striking spectacle. By and large it is the poor and dispossessed, particularly in large, troubled urban areas, who are forced into public schools.

The obvious policy remedy is to make private schools available to poor children, yet the pressure to privatize that is building across the nation misses the most important part of the market, religiously affiliated schools. Chris Whittle, founder of the Edison Project, and John Golle, founder of Education Alternatives may be right -- American public schools may be standing at the threshold of privatization, just as American health care was a decade ago.[55] Indeed, the greatest hope of success for entrepreneurs like Whittle and Golle is the possibility of education vouchers, publicly funding parents rather than schools. They would not have to petition, hat-in-hand, school boards across the country. They could simply open their schools and Devil take the hindmost. A market would emerge, and private schools -- public schools too -- could sell their services to willing clients.

The irony is that it is presumptively constitutional for non-sectarian, private providers to participate in such a market; so far, at least, it is presumptively unconstitutional for religious schools to participate.[56] An astonishing possibility emerges, then; if voucher systems are created that do not include religious schools, it may spell their doom. (Texas has recently passed enabling legislation for a voucher demonstration and Ohio and Illinois are considering such legislation.)

---

[55] It is significant that at the time when the federal government began major forays into the world of health care more than forty years ago, the issue arose as to whether or not Uncle Sam would permit his money to be spent in denominational hospitals. Church and state separation again. With a vengeance. The debate was brisk and one sided; no one seriously proposed that the nation should deny itself so valuable a source of health care as denominational hospitals and health care providers. The idea was absurd on its face.

[56] Presumptively constitutional at the federal level. As noted earlier, neither sectarian nor non-sectarian schools can participate in states with Blaine Amendments; truly anti-Catholicism run utterly amok.

Prosperous religious schools -- Episcopalian and Society of Friends schools, for example -- and religious schools that exert as much cultural as religious pull; Armenian Orthodox or Orthodox Jewish schools, for example -- and fundamentalist schools as well, would not be much affected by being excluded from a voucher system. They would soldier on. The major impact would be to put religiously affiliated schools at significant risk. Not only would they be competing with "free" public schools, they would be competing with "free" non-sectarian private schools.

As it happens, however, there is one point of purchase in the debate and that is at the federal level. In *Aguilar*[57] the Court found that nearly 25 years of accommodation, in which private and parochial schools received Title 1 funds as well as public schools was not constitutional. In large part the finding was the product of a long series of inconsistent findings that comprise modern precedent in this ticklish area. The court has found, for example, that it is legal for the state to make textbooks available to children in religious schools but not maps; as Daniel Patrick Moynihan wryly observes, what will the court make of atlases?[58]

Put most simply, the court has got itself almost hopelessly tangled in its conflicting interpretations of the free exercise clause and the establishment clause. For all intents and purposes *Aguilar* makes it impossible for children to receive Title 1 services in a religious school; the services, if they are made available at all, must be offered in a neutral setting, a public school, or a portable classroom trucked in and set up near the religious school. The idea is preposterous on its face. Indeed, in his concurring opinion in *Aguilar*, Mr.

---

[57] See *Separation of Church and Child, ibid.*

[58] Moynihan, *ibid.*, p 36.

Justice Powell is almost plaintive in urging the Congress to fashion a way out, one that would withstand constitutional scrutiny. Such a program would be Title 1 vouchers. If the Congress used Title 1 to fund poor children rather than schools, the constitutional issue would finally be resolved in a sensible way.[59]

It would be a shock to the founders, no doubt, to see what has become of their handiwork. A constitution designed to protect government from the demands of religion and religion from governmental imposition has become a vehicle for denying poor youngsters the opportunity to attend schools whose programs of study are consistent with their religious convictions.

The role of the federal government in elementary and secondary education should be exactly as it is in other areas -- health care and higher education, for example -- to assure children the right to develop to their fullest potential, not an excuse to prevent children from receiving services in a religious setting.

As a nation, we labor under the ugly residual of a century and one-half of virulent anti-Catholicism, made all the worse be a steadfast refusal to acknowledge it. Even the State of Mississippi, one hundred and fifty years after the Civil War, has seen fit to ratify the 13th amendment. It is time to rethink a social policy that public school teachers themselves do not practice. As the sand flows through the hour glass, the number of Catholic schools continues to decrease and the opportunities for the poor are further diminished.

---

[59] For a full description of the issues involved and how they might be resolved, see Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "What Do You Do When the Supreme Court is Wrong?," *The Public Interest*, vol. 57, Fall, pp. 3-22. Nor altogether surprisingly, Moynihan's answer is "wait." As he assures us that the Court's "most enduring practice is to reverse itself."

It was the great insight of an earlier Gov. Clinton to create "schools for paupers," the nation's first "public schools." It is a bitter irony that our urban schools have become schools for paupers once again, in large measure because of doctrinaire hostility to private education. It throws in high relief the stock response to the news that teachers in troubled districts are more likely to use private schools than the public at-large. The response, dripping condescension, begins: "well, if you control for income ..." or "if you control for race ..." The implicit answer is "what do you expect?" What indeed? Which takes us full circle: what's good enough for rich kids is good enough for poor kids. Given the choice the poor would make it.

Unhappily, the thoughtful economic arguments of thinkers like Milton Friedman have made little headway against what can only be described as reactionary liberalism. Perhaps it is time for a moral argument. Advance the argument not on instrumental or efficiency grounds, but simple human decency. That is the argument that has lead to choice in the other democracies. Only America denies the poor the right to attend the religious -- or non-religious -- schools of their choice. Oddly enough, even in a pragmatic society like ours, the instrumental economic argument makes little progress in the face of overwhelming ideological and bureaucratic opposition. But perhaps that is where the debate belongs. We should support choice because it is the right thing to do.

- END -

THE NUMBERS IN

SUMMARY:

NARRATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

AND

47 TABLES

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This summary is drawn from the 5% household sample of the 1990 Census, prepared for this study as a special run by the Population Division of the US Bureau of the Census. (For ordering information, see the inside back cover). The census data appears on both flexible discs and over 450 pages of finely detailed hard copy. For this report, we have prepared 47 tables which are thematically organized and display the information in a way that is visually easy to read.

The unit the Census employs is the family or subfamily, not the individual child. Accordingly, our study provides information on the enrollment patterns of parents, the percent of parents who behave in a certain manner, not the percent of children who do.

Our major interest was to determine where teachers send their children to school, public or private, by occupation (public or private school teacher) place of residence (state and city), race (black, white, other), ethnicity (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) and income (the national median, $35K and below, twice the national median, $70 K and above, and the range in between, $35K to $70K.)

Unfortunately, there were data limitations which made it necessary for us to undercount the number of teachers who chose private schools for

their children:

- The sample could not provide a perfect count of teachers by city of residence and the school district in which the teachers work. Thus, the common case of a teacher who works in the city and lives in the suburbs is counted as a suburban teacher, one who is much more likely to patronize public school (indeed, the reason for living in the suburbs is typically to avoid the public school system in which the teacher in question works). There is, of course, the rarer case of a teacher who works in the suburbs but lives in the city; he or she will be counted as an urban dweller (one who is more likely to patronize private schools). To a certain extent, these numbers "wash," but on balance the number of teachers who patronize private schools will be understated. So too is the "connoisseurship" implicit in moving to a district with "good" schools.
- The sample could not provide "central city" as compared to non-central city, nor could it distinguish between metropolitan school districts (like Indianapolis IN) in which the district is actually bigger than the city and more compact districts whose "urban" character is more uniformly distributed across the district (Boston as contrasted to Dallas, for example.) This too leads to an undercount; in larger, sprawling urban districts there remain "islands" of excellence, "good" public schools in which teachers may enroll their children. Indeed, in some districts, teachers are afforded "open" enrollment options that are not available to the public at-large.

With these data limitations in mind, the most important numbers included in our study come from the category "all or some private,"

meaning the parents enrolling some or all of their children in private school. We use this category over "all private" because it indicates a willingness to use private schools despite financial obstacles which might hinder parents from sending all of their children to private school.

What do the numbers reveal?

THE STATES

- The majority of all parents in the United States send their children to public schools. In the entire United States 13.1% of all parents enroll all or some of their children in private school. Of all the states, Hawaii and Delaware have the highest private school enrollment; in Hawaii 21.4% of all parents send all or some of their children to private school, in Delaware 20.6% of all parents do so. Wyoming and West Virginia have the lowest rates of private school enrollment; there 5.5% and 5.0% of parents send their children to private school, respectively. [1]

- Of all parents, just over 6% are teachers; over 75% of those are public school teachers, and less than 25% teach private school. As a group, teachers, are more likely than the public at large to enroll their children in private school (17.1% to 13.1%). In Hawaii, for example, 32.2% of teachers send all or some of their children to private school, compared to 21.4% of the general population. In Delaware 30.7% of teachers enroll their children in private school while 20.6% of all parents do. In addition, while only 19.7% of the public enrolls its children in private school in the District of

[1] See Table 10.

Columbia, 35.4% of teachers send all or some children to private school.

In all states but two, in fact, teachers send their children to private school at a rate greater than does the population at large; in Montana 7.4% of both teachers and all parents send their children to private school; and in Alaska 7.4% of all parents enroll their children in private school while only 7.0% of all teachers do. Alaska, then, is the only state in which teachers send their children to private school at a rate lower than does the population at large.[2]

- Not surprisingly, private school teachers enroll their children in private school at rates much higher than does the population at large. This is true for all states. The largest differences are in Delaware and the District of Columbia; in Delaware 61.9% of private school teachers enroll their children in private school, compared with 20.6% of all parents, a difference of 41.3%; and in the District of Columbia 60.7% of private school teachers, versus 19.7% of all parents, send their children to private school, a difference of 41.0%.

The smallest differences are found in North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming; in North Dakota 15.2% of private school teachers and 6.9% of all parents send their children to private school, a difference of 8.3%; in South Dakota 13.9% of teachers and 8.1% of parents do

[2] See Table 10

so, a difference of 5.8%; and in Wyoming 10.5% of teachers and 5.0% of parents do so, a difference of 5.5%.[3]

- More interesting are the enrollment patterns of public school teachers. Public school teachers are less likely than private school teachers to enroll their children in private school. Moreover, in the United States overall, they are slightly less likely than is the general population to send their children to private school; the national average for private school enrollment for all parents is 13.1%, and for public school teachers it is 12.1%. However in 14 states and DC - Arizona, California, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, West Virginia and Wyoming - public school teachers are more likely than the public at large to send some or all of their children to private school.

  The differences are greatest in the District of Columbia, Hawaii and Rhode Island; in the District of Columbia 28.2% of public school teachers and 19.7% of all parents send their children to public school, a difference of 8.5%; in Hawaii 25.0% of teachers and 21.4% of parents do so, a difference of 3.6%; and in Rhode Island 22.1% of teachers and 18.1% of parents do so, a difference of 4.0%. The pattern differs for public school teachers in troubled urban areas.[4]

- Controlling for income and race sheds more light on the numbers for the entire United States. First, income. Higher income families are

[3] See Table 13.

[4] See Table 12.

nearly twice as likely to use private schools as lower income families: in the nation as a whole (24.2% to 13.1. Interestingly, while low income public school teachers are more likely to use private schools than low income parents generally (9.8% to 8.4%) middle income public school teachers are less likely to use private schools, by a margin of 3.5% (11.6% to 15.2%). And in the highest income bracket, where "all family" use of private schools climbs to 24.2%, only 15.2% of private school teachers use private school. Of all teachers who enroll their children in private school, 19.9% are in the highest, 16.4% in the middle and 15.8% in the lowest bracket. Income is only a very modest predictor of propensity to use private schools. [5]

- As we have seen, parents with higher incomes are much more likely to enroll their children in private school than are those with lower incomes. In the United States 13.1% of all parents send their children to private school; 24.2% of all parents who earn more than $70,000 annually do; 15.2% of parents who earn between $35,000 and $70,000 do; while only 8.4% of parents who earn less than $35,000 do. The greatest percent of parents in the highest income bracket enroll their children in private school in the District of Columbia and Louisiana; in the District of Columbia 51.6% of parents earning more than $70,000 annually do; in Louisiana 49.3% do. The smallest percent are found in Alaska (8.5%), Montana (9.4%) and Wyoming (5.0%). In the middle income bracket the greatest percent of parents who enroll their children in private school is found in Louisiana, where 28.5% do.

[5] See Tables 37 and 38.

The smallest percent exist in Utah and Wyoming, where 6.0% and 4.9% do, respectively. In the lowest income bracket the largest percent are found in New Jersey (14.2%) and Pennsylvania (14.4%). The smallest are found in North Carolina (4.4%), Utah (4.6%) and West Virginia (3.7%). This pattern is found in all but one state; in Wyoming 5.0% of all parents enroll their children in private school; 5.0% of parents in the highest income bracket do so; 4.9% of parents in the middle bracket do so; however, 5.1% of parents in the lowest income bracket do so.[6]

- What is most interesting is the percent of teachers, particularly public school teachers, who earn in the highest income bracket. They are nearly twice as likely as the public at-large to be high earners. While 14% of all families earn more than $70,000 annually, 36% earn between $35 and $70,000, and 50% earn less than $35,000, 26.65 of public school teachers earn more than $70,000 a year. And while half of all parents are in the lowest income bracket, fewer than twenty-five percent of all teachers are; indeed, more than half of all teachers are in the middle bracket.[7]

- Race and ethnicity are reported by the Census Bureau as white, black and other and not-Hispanic and Hispanic. White parents make up just under 77% of all parents;, slightly less than 90% of parents are not Hispanic.[8]

---

[6] See Bureau of the Census, five percent sample, 1990 Census.

[7] See Table 38.

[8] See Table 28.

- White parents are somewhat more likely than nonwhite parents to send their children to private school. In the United States 13.1% of all parents send their children to private school; 14.2% of white parents do so; 8.1% of black parents do so; 10.8% of parents of other races do so; broken down by ethnicity, 13.4% of Hispanic parents do so while 10.1% of non-Hispanic parents do so.[9]

  The numbers for all teachers for the first category follow a similar pattern. For all teachers the numbers total 17.1%; white teachers 17.5%, black teachers 14.2% and teachers of other races 15.9%. Broken down by ethnicity, however, more Hispanic teachers (18.7%) than non-Hispanic teachers (17.1%) use private schools.

  Private school teachers follow the pattern for all parents for both categories. 32.7% of all, 33.9% of white, 20.3% of black and 24.7% of private school teachers of other races enroll their children in private school. In the second category, 32.9% of private school teachers who are not Hispanic and 27.0% of those who are Hispanic do so.

  And while 12.1% of all public school teachers send their children to private school - one point less than the public at large - white teachers are less likely than teacher in general to use private schools (11.9%); black teachers are almost as likely as the public at large to use private schools (12.9% as compared to 13.1%)[10]

---

[9] See Table 29.

[10] See Table 28.

100 LARGEST CITES

The national and state patterns we have touched upon above change dramatically in the one hundred largest cities: although the majority of all parents enroll their children in public school, the balance tips dramatically in a number of cities. Jersey City, Philadelphia and Yonkers, for example, have the highest private school enrollment, at 34.4%, 34.7% and 34.5%, respectively. Of the 20 largest cities, 15 - Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Columbus, Dallas, Detroit, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Memphis, Milwaukee, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Washington - show private school enrollment for all parents above the national average while only 5 - Houston, Phoenix, San Antonio, San Diego and San Jose - do not.[11]

- Teachers in cities are substantially more likely to enroll their children in private school than are all parents. In 97 of the 100 largest cities in the United States the percent of all teachers who enroll their children in private school is greater than that of all parents who do so. The largest differences exist in Baltimore, Cleveland and Grand Rapids, where teacher enrollment in private schools is 25.5%, 27.6% and 27.7% higher than the population at large; in Baltimore 43.6% of all teachers and 18.1% of all parents send their children to private school; in Cleveland 25.2% of parents and 52.8% of teachers do; in Grand Rapids 27.3% of parents and 55.0% of teachers do.

[11] See Table 32.

The highest percent of private school enrollment are found in Grand Rapids, Honolulu and Jersey City, where 55.1%, 50.5% and 51.4% of teachers enroll all or some of their children in private school, respectively. The smallest percent of private school enrollment for teachers are found in Aurora, CO and Fresno, CA, where only 6.8% and 6.2% of teachers send their children to private school, respectively. In only 14 of the 100 cities is the difference between the percent of private school enrollment for teachers and all parents less than the national average; in 83 of the 100 largest cities the difference between the private school enrollment percent for teachers and all parents is greater than or equal to the national average.

Only in Arlington, VA, Aurora, CO and Glendale, CA do teachers have lower private school enrollment percent than do all parents; in Arlington 15.6% of teachers and 17.3% of parents send their children to private school, a difference of -1.7%; in Aurora 6.8% of teachers and 7.8% of parents do so, a difference of -1.0%; and in Glendale 19.8% of teachers and 20.2% of parents do so, a difference of -0.4%.[12]

In urban areas private school teachers are even more likely to send their children to private school, in some cases far more likely to send their children to private than public school. In 73 of the 100 largest cities in the United States private school teachers enroll their children in private school at a rate higher than the 32.7% national

[12] See Table 19.

average, and in 37 cities over half of private school teachers send all or some of their children to private school.

The greatest percent of private school teachers enroll their children in private school in Nashville-Davidson(74.4%), Richmond(83.6%) and Yonkers(74.7%). The smallest percent are found in Aurora, CO(4.9%) and Colorado Springs, CO(13.2%). The greatest differences between the percent for all parents and private school teachers are found in Montgomery, Nashville-Davidson and Richmond; in Montgomery 17.9% of all parents and 73.6% of private school teachers send their children to private school, a difference of 55.7%; in Nashville-Davidson 19.1% of parents and 74.4% of private school teachers do so, a difference of 55.3%; and in Richmond 13.4% of parents and 83.6% of private school teachers do, a difference of 70.2%.

The smallest differences are found in Colorado Springs, CO and Newark, NJ; in Colorado Springs 9.7% of all parents and 13.2% of private school teachers enroll their children in private school; and in Newark 18.8% of parents and 23.6% of private school teachers do so, a difference of 4.8%. Finally, Aurora, CO is the only exception to this trend; in Aurora a smaller percent of private school teachers than of all parents send their children to private school; 7.8% of all parents enroll their children in private school while only 4.9% of private school teachers do so, a difference of negative 2.9%.[13]

[13] See Table 19.

- Public school teachers in the 100 largest cities in the United States are generally more likely than is the public at large to enroll their children in private school. In 69 of the 100 cities the percent of private school teachers who send their children to private school is greater than that of all parents who do so. In 76 of the 100 cities the percent of private school teachers who enroll their children in private school is greater than the national average.

The largest percent of private school enrollment among public school teachers exist in Boston (44.6%), Honolulu (45.0) and Jersey City (50.3%). The largest differences between the percent of public school teachers and all parents who send their children to private school are found in Miami and Newark; in Miami 13.2% of all parents and 31.4% of public school teachers enroll their children in private school, a difference of 18.2%; in Newark 18.8% of parents and 37.8% of public school teachers do so, a difference of 19.0%.

The smallest percent of public school teachers who send their children to private school are found in Charlotte, NC, Mesa, AZ (both 5.5%) and Santa Ana, CA (3.5%). In cities where the percent of public school teachers who send their children to private school is smaller than that of all parents who do so, the greatest differences are found in Arlington, VA and Charlotte, NC; in Arlington 17.3% of all parents and 11.0% of public school teachers enroll their children in private school, a difference of -6.3%; and in Charlotte 13.4% of parents and 5.5% of public school teachers do so, a difference of -7.9%.

Finally, it is significant that in 19 of the largest 20 cities in the

United States the percent of public school teachers who send their children to private school is both greater than the national average and greater than the percent of all parents who do so; only in Memphis, is it not. It seems clear that in the largest urban areas public school teachers as a rule are more likely than the population at large to enroll their children in private school. [14]

For additional material, see the 47 tables that follow.

[14] See Table 18.

MASTER LIST OF TABLES:

A NOTE ON TABLE ORGANIZATION: DATA IS PRESENTED FOR STATES AND THEN CITIES. WITHIN EACH CATEGORY DATA IS PRESENTED FOR ALL FAMILIES, THEN ALL TEACHERS, THEN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, THEN PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS. FINALLY, DATA IS PRESENTED FOR RACE AND THEN INCOME.

A NOTE ON NOMENCLATURE: WHEN LISTED WITH STATES, WASHINGTON DC APPEARS AS "DC;" WHEN LISTED WITH CITIES IT APPEARS AS "WASHINGTON DC."

TABLES 1 THROUGH 5 ARE TAKEN FROM NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS DATA. THE SPECIFIC SOURCE IS NOTED IN EACH TABLE.

TABLES 6 THROUGH 47 ARE TAKEN FROM THE 5% SAMPLE DETAIL FILE OF THE 1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING. THE NUMBERS WERE PRODUCED IN A SPECIAL RUN FOR THIS STUDY BY THE POPULATION DIVISION OF THE US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

FOR ORDERING INFORMATION, SEE THE BACK INSIDE COVER.

13 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, THE FIFTY STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

14 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY STATE

15 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY STATE

16 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

17 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

18 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

19 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

20 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

21 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS, BY CITY

22 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

23 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY CITY

24 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY CITY

25 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

26 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

27 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

28 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, BY RACE, UNITED STATES

29 RACIAL BREAKDOWN FOR ALL CATEGORIES, UNITED STATES

30 PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY RACE, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

TABLE 1

PRIVATE SCHOOLS BY TYPE AND SCHOOL LEVEL, UNITED STATES, 1989-90

PRIVATE SCHOOL TYPE/LEVEL	PERCENT OF TOTAL
	#
TOTAL	26,712
	%
CATHOLIC	33.9
PAROCHIAL	21.7
DIOCESAN	8.7
PRIVATE	3.5
OTHER RELIGIOUS	48.2
CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN	15.2
AFFILIATED	15.3
UNAFFILIATED	17.7
NONSECTARIAN	17.9
REGULAR	7.5
SPECIAL EMPHASIS	7.0
SPECIAL EDUCATION	3.4
ELEMENTARY	61.8
SECONDARY	9.3
COMBINED	28.9

NOTE: FOR COMPARABILITY PURPOSES, 1989-90 DATA IS USED.

SOURCE: PRIVATE SCHOOL UNIVERSE SURVEY, 1989-90, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, E.D. TABS, DECEMBER 1992, NCES 93-122.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS BY SCHOOL TYPE AND SCHOOL LEVEL, UNITED STATES, 1989-90

PRIVATE SCHOOL TYPE/LEVEL	PERCENT OF TOTAL
	#
TOTAL	4,838,497
	%
CATHOLIC	54.5
PAROCHIAL	32.2
DIOCESAN	15.2
PRIVATE	7.1
OTHER RELIGIOUS	32.3
CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN	10.9
AFFILIATED	12.8
UNAFFILIATED	8.5
NONSECTARIAN	13.2
REGULAR	8.0
SPECIAL EMPHASIS	3.8
SPECIAL EDUCATION	1.4
ELEMENTARY	57.1
SECONDARY	17.4
COMBINED	25.5

NOTE: FOR COMPARABILITY PURPOSES, 1989-90 DATA WAS USED.

SOURCE: PRIVATE SCHOOL UNIVERSE SURVEY, 1989-90, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, E.D. TABS, DECEMBER 1992, NCES 93-122.

TABLE 3

FTE TEACHERS BY SCHOOL TYPE AND SCHOOL LEVEL, UNITED STATES, 1989-90

PRIVATE SCHOOL TYPE/LEVEL	PERCENT OF TOTAL
	#
TOTAL	331,533
	%
CATHOLIC	43.4
PAROCHIAL	23.8
DIOCESAN	12.2
PRIVATE	7.4
OTHER RELIGIOUS	35.6
CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN	11.7
AFFILIATED	13.8
UNAFFILIATED	10.1
NONSECTARIAN	20.9
REGULAR	11.6
SPECIAL EMPHASIS	5.9
SPECIAL EDUCATION	3.5
ELEMENTARY	47.7
SECONDARY	19.0
COMBINED	33.3

NOTE: FOR COMPARABILITY PURPOSES, 1989-90 DATA WAS USED.

SOURCE: PRIVATE SCHOOL UNIVERSE SURVEY, 1989-90, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, E.D. TABS, DECEMBER 1992, NCES 93-122.

TABLE 4

PUBLIC EXPENDITURES AND PRIVATE SCHOOL TUITION, UNITED STATES, 1990-91

SCHOOL TYPE	AVERAGE ELEMENTARY	AVERAGE SECONDARY
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE *	$5,177	$6,472
PRIVATE TUITION	$1,780	$4,395
CATHOLIC	$1,243	$2,878
OTHER RELIGIOUS	$1,738	$4,039
NONSECTARIAN	$3,748	$9,625
ALL MEMBERS OF NAIS	$5,066	$7,306

* NOTE: PUBLIC SCHOOL EXPENDITURES BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ARE TAKEN FROM *EDUCATION AT A GLANCE: OECD INDICATORS*, OECD, PARIS 1993, P 92. USOEO/OERI/NCES DOES NOT REPORT EXPENDITURES BY THESE CATEGORIES IN *THE CONDITION OF EDUCATION* BECAUSE STATES DO NOT REPORT TO WASHINGTON BY THESE CATEGORIES. THE NUMBERS WERE RUN BY NCES FOR OECD FOR *EDUCATION AT A GLANCE.*

TABLE 5

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL SIZE, UNITED STATES, 1990-91

SCHOOL TYPE	NUMBER	<50	50-99	100-149	150-299	>300
PUBLIC	79,885	3.1	3.9	5.3	18.5	69.2
PRIVATE	24,690	24.5	17.0	11.4	28.5	18.6
CATH.	8,731	1.4	7.0	11.1	47.5	33.0
OTHER RELIG.	11,476	39.4	20.0	12.2	18.1	10.3
NONSEC.	4,483	31.3	28.9	10.1	17.8	11.9
NAIS	1,498	2.7	14.5	11.1	30.9	40.9

NOTE: FOR COMPARABILITY PURPOSES, 1990-91 DATA WAS USED.

SOURCE: PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES: A STATISTICAL PROFILE, 1990-91, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS REPORT, JANUARY 1995, NCES 95-330.

TABLE 6

POPULATION OVERVIEW, UNITED STATES

	HEADS OF FAMILIES AND SUBFAMILIES	HEADS OF FAMILIES AND SUBFAMILIES WITH CHILDREN	PERCENT OF ALL IN CATEGORY
ALL FAMILIES	67,609,618	24,344,317	36.0
ALL TEACHERS	3,216,713	1,509,077	46.9
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	2,486,408	1,138,082	45.8
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	730,305	370,995	50.8

TABLE 7

TEACHERS AS PERCENT OF POPULATION, UNITED STATES

	PERCENT OF ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT OF ALL FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN
ALL TEACHERS	4.8	-
TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	2.2	6.2
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	3.7	-
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	1.7	4.7
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	1.1	-
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	0.5	1.5

TABLE 8

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS AS PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS, UNITED STATES

	PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS	PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	77.3	-
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	35.4	75.4
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	22.7	-
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	11.5	24.6

TABLE 9

POPULATION OVERVIEW, THE THIRTY LARGEST CITIES

CITY	HEADS OF FAMILIES AND SUBFAMILIES	HEADS WITH CHILDREN	HEADS WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS	HEADS WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN
UNITED STATES	67,609,618	24,344,317	3,216,713	1,509,077
NEW YORK	1,876,347	645,877	64,587	25,344
LOS ANGELES	828,798	297,013	25,216	9,615
CHICAGO	695,142	259,357	20,515	8,323
HOUSTON	418,926	157,410	16,252	6,735
PHILADELPHIA	414,204	140,038	12,677	5,060
SAN DIEGO	264,925	92,373	10,738	4,469
DETROIT	271,415	110,723	7,352	3,025
DALLAS	255,287	89,040	9,194	3,527
PHOENIX	260,469	93,973	9,879	4,614
SAN ANTONIO	249,113	101,634	11,315	5,447
SAN JOSE	199,436	74,912	7,527	3,524
INDIANAPOLIS	198,470	69,185	7,504	2,991
BALTIMORE	194,962	67,856	5,265	1,944
SAN FRAN.	154,654	44,693	4,094	1,328
JACKSONVILLE	175,790	63,961	7,688	3,465
COLUMBUS OH	158,034	54,439	5,899	2,281
MILWAUKEE	159,315	61,871	4,817	1,876
MEMPHIS	167,200	60,494	7,793	3,440
WASH. DC	137,561	44,816	3,912	1,397
BOSTON	124,116	39,564	3,597	1,363
EL PASO	138,031	62,337	8,259	4,021
SEATTLE	117,260	30,751	3,694	1,360
CLEVELAND	133,442	48,421	2,117	860
NASH.-DAVID.	131,095	43,549	4,907	1,979
AUSTIN	109,570	39,483	5,212	2,174
NEW ORLEANS	129,440	51,181	6,922	3,141
DENVER	115,271	37,148	4,732	1,688
FORT WORTH	117,940	42,420	5,362	2,041
OKLA. CITY	121,920	43,765	4,636	1,985
PORTLAND OR	108,383	34,298	4,440	1,719

TABLE 10

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, THE FIFTY STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE	ALL FAMILIES	ALL TEACHERS	PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS
UNITED STATES	13.1	17.1	12.1	32.7
ALABAMA	10.4	16.1	10.4	38.0
ALASKA	7.4	7.0	4.1	36.1
ARIZONA	8.3	11.3	8.6	23.1
ARKANSAS	7.6	10.4	7.4	22.4
CALIFORNIA	13.3	19.1	13.9	37.7
COLORADO	9.3	12.1	9.1	22.5
CONNECTICUT	15.9	18.9	15.5	32.4
DELAWARE	20.6	30.7	19.1	61.9
DC	19.7	36.4	28.2	60.7
FLORIDA	14.3	18.9	12.4	43.0
GEORGIA	10.0	15.2	9.9	41.4
HAWAII	21.4	32.2	25.0	59.5
IDAHO	6.4	7.6	4.8	22.9
ILLINOIS	17.6	22.4	17.0	33.8
INDIANA	11.6	16.2	11.7	25.8
IOWA	11.2	14.0	9.6	25.8
KANSAS	10.7	12.9	9.1	23.3
KENTUCKY	10.4	13.5	7.8	35.2
LOUISIANA	18.8	28.2	21.0	51.3
MAINE	7.7	10.6	7.5	24.8
MARYLAND	16.3	22.5	14.6	51.2
MA	16.7	20.4	17.3	33.7
MICHIGAN	12.5	18.1	13.4	27.5
MINNESOTA	12.5	14.5	10.1	26.1
MISSISSIPPI	11.7	16.9	11.0	42.4
MISSOURI	15.5	19.2	12.1	31.1
MONTANA	7.4	7.4	5.4	18.3
NEBRASKA	13.7	15.5	11.1	27.9
NEVADA	7.4	11.2	9.2	23.8
NH	15.2	17.6	13.2	33.6
NEW JERSEY	19.3	23.0	17.9	38.2
NEW MEXICO	8.2	9.6	6.5	24.9
NEW YORK	17.8	20.6	15.9	32.4
NC	7.0	10.2	6.2	38.1
ND	6.9	7.5	5.2	15.4
OHIO	14.7	21.0	15.2	30.8
OKLAHOMA	7.3	9.0	5.5	22.9
OREGON	10.0	12.1	9.6	22.6
PENNSYLVANIA	19.4	22.7	16.5	32.8

TABLE 10 CONT.

RHODE ISLAND	18.1	25.8	22.1	42.3
SC	9.3	14.4	9.6	39.7
SD	8.1	9.3	7.5	13.9
TENNESSEE	9.3	14.1	7.8	46.0
TEXAS	8.5	12.9	9.1	22.6
UTAH	6.0	6.1	4.3	17.8
VERMONT	9.0	11.2	8.8	21.8
VIRGINIA	9.8	14.2	9.0	40.3
WASH. DC	11.1	13.4	9.1	30.9
WEST VIRGINIA	5.5	9.2	5.6	34.4
WISCONSIN	17.3	21.6	14.8	33.2
WYOMING	5.0	6.2	5.1	10.5

TABLE 11

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (13.1); THE FIVE STATES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

STATE	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
CALIFORNIA	86.7	10.3	3.0	13.3
CONNECTICUT	84.1	11.7	4.2	15.9
DELAWARE	79.4	17.1	3.5	20.6
DC	80.3	17.0	2.7	19.7
FLORIDA	85.7	11.2	3.1	14.3
HAWAII	78.6	16.7	4.6	21.4
ILLINOIS	82.4	13.8	3.8	17.6
LOUISIANA	81.2	15.6	3.2	18.8
MARYLAND	83.7	13.1	3.3	16.3
MA	83.3	12.1	4.6	16.7
MISSOURI	84.5	12.4	3.1	15.5
NEBRASKA	86.3	10.0	3.7	13.7
NH	84.8	10.2	5.0	15.
NEW JERSEY	80.7	14.7	4.6	19.3
NEW YORK	82.2	14.1	3.7	17.8
OHIO	85.3	11.6	3.1	14.7
PENNSYLVANIA	80.6	15.6	3.9	19.4
RHODE ISLAND	81.9	14.0	4.2	18.1
WISCONSIN	82.7	12.9	4.4	17.3
UNITED STATES	86.9	10.1	3.0	13.1
IDAHO	93.6	4.2	2.2	6.4
ND	93.1	4.5	2.3	6.9
UTAH	94.0	3.4	2.6	6.0
WEST VIRGINIA	94.5	4.0	1.4	5.5
WYOMING	95.0	3.2	1.8	5.0

TABLE 12

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (17.1); THE FIVE STATES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

STATE	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
CALIFORNIA	80.9	14.2	4.9	19.1
CONNECTICUT	81.1	13.0	5.9	18.9
DELAWARE	69.3	25.9	4.8	30.7
DC	63.6	32.4	3.9	36.4
FLORIDA	81.1	14.6	4.4	18.9
HAWAII	67.8	24.1	8.1	32.2
ILLINOIS	77.6	17.4	5.0	22.4
LOUISIANA	71.8	23.1	5.1	28.2
MARYLAND	77.5	17.2	5.2	22.5
MA	79.6	13.4	7.0	20.4
MICHIGAN	81.9	14.2	3.9	18.1
MISSOURI	80.8	15.1	4.1	19.2
NH	82.4	10.6	7.0	17.6
NEW JERSEY	77.0	17.1	5.9	23.0
NEW YORK	79.4	16.3	4.3	20.6
OHIO	79.0	16.5	4.5	21.0
PA	77.3	17.6	5.1	22.7
RI	74.2	21.0	4.9	25.8
WISCONSIN	78.4	16.0	5.5	21.6
UNITED STATES	82.9	12.9	4.3	17.1
ALASKA	93.0	4.8	2.3	7.0
MONTANA	92.6	3.6	3.8	7.4
ND	92.5	4.2	3.3	7.5
UTAH	93.9	3.4	2.6	6.1
WYOMING	93.8	3.3	2.9	6.2

TABLE 13

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, THE FIFTY STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
UNITED STATES	87.9	8.4	3.7	12.1
ALABAMA	89.6	7.2	3.2	10.4
ALASKA	95.9	2.2	1.9	4.1
ARIZONA	91.4	5.8	2.8	8.6
ARKANSAS	92.6	5.0	2.4	7.4
CALIFORNIA	86.1	9.8	4.0	13.9
COLORADO	90.9	6.0	3.1	9.1
CONNECTICUT	84.5	10.1	5.4	15.5
DELAWARE	80.9	14.4	4.6	19.1
DC	71.8	23.9	4.4	28.2
FLORIDA	87.6	8.8	3.6	12.4
GEORGIA	90.1	6.5	3.4	9.9
HAWAII	75.0	17.5	7.4	25.0
IDAHO	95.2	2.0	2.8	4.8
ILLINOIS	83.0	12.9	4.1	17.0
INDIANA	88.3	7.7	4.0	11.7
IOWA	90.4	6.2	3.4	9.6
KANSAS	90.9	5.8	3.3	9.1
KENTUCKY	92.2	5.7	2.1	7.8
LOUISIANA	79.0	16.5	4.5	21.0
MAINE	92.5	4.3	3.3	7.5
MARYLAND	85.4	10.0	4.6	14.6
MA	82.7	10.6	6.7	17.3
MICHIGAN	86.6	10.0	3.4	13.4
MINNESOTA	89.9	6.4	3.7	10.1
MISSISSIPPI	89.0	7.8	3.1	11.0
MISSOURI	87.9	8.7	3.4	12.1
MONTANA	94.6	2.3	3.1	5.4
NEBRASKA	88.9	6.3	4.8	11.1
NEVADA	90.8	4.6	4.6	9.2
NH	86.8	7.2	6.0	13.2
NEW JERSEY	82.1	12.6	5.3	17.9
NEW MEXICO	93.5	3.7	2.8	6.5
NEW YORK	84.1	12.0	3.9	15.9
NC	93.8	3.9	2.3	6.2
ND	94.8	2.7	2.4	5.2
OHIO	84.8	11.1	4.1	15.2
OKLAHOMA	94.5	3.1	2.3	5.5
OREGON	90.4	5.5	4.2	9.6
PENNSYLVANIA	83.5	12.0	4.5	16.5

TABLE 13 CONT.

RHODE ISLAND	77.9	17.5	4.6	22.1
SC	90.4	6.4	3.2	9.6
SD	92.5	4.4	3.1	7.5
TENNESSEE	92.2	5.3	2.5	7.8
TEXAS	90.9	6.1	3.0	9.1
UTAH	95.7	2.3	2.0	4.3
VERMONT	91.2	4.2	4.7	8.8
VIRGINIA	91.0	6.1	2.9	9.0
WASHINGTON	90.9	5.7	3.5	9.1
WEST VIRGINIA	94.4	3.6	2.0	5.6
WISCONSIN	85.2	10.4	4.4	14.8
WYOMING	94.9	2.7	2.4	5.1

TABLE 14

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (12.1); THE FIVE STATES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

STATE	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
CALIFORNIA	86.1	9.8	4.0	13.9
CONNECTICUT	84.5	10.1	5.4	15.5
DELAWARE	80.9	14.4	4.6	19.1
DC	71.8	23.9	4.4	28.2
FLORIDA	87.6	8.8	3.6	12.4
HAWAII	75.0	17.5	7.4	25.0
ILLINOIS	83.0	12.9	4.1	17.0
LOUISIANA	79.0	16.5	4.5	21.0
MARYLAND	85.4	10.0	4.6	14.6
MA	82.7	10.6	6.7	17.3
MICHIGAN	86.6	10.0	3.4	13.4
MISSOURI	87.9	8.7	3.4	12.1
NH	86.8	7.2	6.0	13.2
NEW JERSEY	82.1	12.6	5.3	17.9
NEW YORK	84.1	12.0	3.9	15.9
OHIO	84.8	11.1	4.1	15.2
PA	83.5	12.0	4.5	16.5
RI	77.9	17.5	4.6	22.1
WISCONSIN	85.2	10.4	4.4	14.8
UNITED STATES	87.9	8.4	3.7	12.1
ALASKA	95.9	2.2	1.9	4.1
IDAHO	95.2	2.0	2.8	4.8
ND	94.8	2.7	2.4	5.2
UTAH	95.7	2.3	2.0	4.3
WYOMING	94.9	2.7	2.4	5.1

TABLE 15

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (32.7); THE FIVE STATES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

STATE	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
ALABAMA	62.0	33.0	5.0	38.0
ALASKA	63.9	30.8	5.4	36.1
CALIFORNIA	62.3	29.8	7.9	37.7
DELAWARE	38.1	56.7	5.2	61.9
DC	39.3	58.2	2.6	60.7
FLORIDA	57.0	36.0	7.0	43.0
GEORGIA	58.6	35.3	6.1	41.4
HAWAII	40.5	48.9	10.6	59.5
ILLINOIS	66.2	27.0	6.8	33.8
KENTUCKY	64.8	28.1	7.1	35.2
LOUISIANA	48.7	44.2	7.1	51.3
MARYLAND	48.8	43.6	7.6	51.2
MA	66.3	25.5	8.2	33.7
MISSISSIPPI	57.6	38.8	3.6	42.4
NH	66.4	23.0	10.6	33.6
NEW JERSEY	61.8	30.5	7.7	38.2
NC	61.9	34.1	4.1	38.1
PA	67.2	26.6	6.2	32.8
RI	57.7	36.3	6.0	42.3
SC	60.3	33.5	6.1	39.7
TENNESSEE	54.0	40.0	6.0	46.0
VIRGINIA	59.7	33.2	7.1	40.3
WV	65.6	28.0	6.3	34.4
WISCONSIN	61.8	29.9	8.3	38.2
UNITED STATES	67.3	26.6	6.1	32.7
MONTANA	81.7	10.8	7.5	18.3
ND	84.6	9.2	6.2	15.4
SD	86.1	10.5	3.4	13.9
UTAH	82.2	11.2	6.7	17.8
WYOMING	89.5	5.6	4.8	10.5

TABLE 16

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL FAMILIES WHO DO SO IS GREATER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (4.0); THE ONLY STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF ALL PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THAT OF ALL TEACHERS WHO DO SO

STATE	ALL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
ALABAMA	16.1	10.4	5.7
CALIFORNIA	19.1	13.3	5.8
DELAWARE	30.7	20.6	10.1
DC	36.4	19.7	16.7
FLORIDA	18.9	14.3	4.6
GEORGIA	15.2	10.0	5.2
HAWAII	32.2	21.4	10.8
ILLINOIS	22.4	17.6	4.8
INDIANA	16.2	11.6	4.6
LOUISIANA	28.2	18.8	9.4
MARYLAND	22.5	16.3	6.2
MICHIGAN	18.1	12.5	5.6
MISSISSIPPI	16.9	11.7	5.2
OHIO	21.0	14.7	6.3
RHODE ISLAND	25.8	18.1	7.7
SOUTH CAROLINA	14.4	9.3	5.1
TENNESSEE	14.1	9.3	4.8
TEXAS	12.9	8.5	4.4
VIRGINIA	14.2	9.8	4.4
WISCONSIN	21.6	17.3	4.3
UNITED STATES	17.1	13.1	4.0
ALASKA	7.0	7.4	-0.4
MONTANA	7.4	7.4	0.0

TABLE 17

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THAT OF ALL PARENTS WHO DO SO; THE FIVE STATES WHERE THE NEGATIVE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF ALL PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ALL PARENTS WHO DO SO IS GREATEST

STATE	PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
ALABAMA	10.4	10.4	0.0
ARIZONA	8.6	8.3	0.3
CALIFORNIA	13.9	13.3	0.6
DC	28.2	19.7	8.5
HAWAII	25.0	21.4	3.6
INDIANA	11.7	11.6	0.1
LOUISIANA	21.0	18.8	2.2
MASSACHUSETTS	17.3	16.7	0.6
MICHIGAN	13.4	12.5	0.9
NEVADA	9.2	7.4	1.8
OHIO	15.2	14.7	0.5
RHODE ISLAND	22.1	18.1	4.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	9.6	9.3	0.3
TEXAS	9.1	8.5	0.6
WEST VIRGINIA	5.6	5.5	0.1
WYOMING	5.1	5.0	0.1
UNITED STATES	12.1	13.1	-1.0
ALASKA	4.1	7.4	-3.3
KENTUCKY	7.8	10.4	-2.6
MISSOURI	12.1	15.5	-3.4
NEBRASKA	11.1	13.7	-2.6
PENNSYLVANIA	16.5	19.4	-2.9

TABLE 18

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY STATE

STATES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL PARENTS WHO DO SO IS GREATER THAN THE NATIONAL AVERAGE (19.6); THE FIVE STATES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE IS SMALLEST

STATE	PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
ALABAMA	38.0	10.4	27.6
ALASKA	36.1	7.4	28.7
CALIFORNIA	37.7	13.3	24.4
DELAWARE	61.9	20.6	41.3
DC	60.7	19.7	41.0
FLORIDA	43.0	14.3	28.7
GEORGIA	41.4	10.0	31.4
HAWAII	59.5	21.4	38.1
KENTUCKY	35.2	10.4	24.8
LOUISIANA	51.3	18.8	32.5
MARYLAND	51.2	16.3	34.9
MISSISSIPPI	42.4	11.7	30.7
NORTH CAROLINA	38.1	7.0	31.1
RHODE ISLAND	42.3	18.1	24.2
SOUTH CAROLINA	39.7	9.3	30.4
TENNESSEE	46.0	9.3	36.7
VIRGINIA	40.3	9.8	30.5
WASHINGTON	30.9	11.1	19.8
WEST VIRGINIA	34.4	5.5	28.9
WISCONSIN	38.2	17.3	20.9
UNITED STATES	32.7	13.1	19.6
MONTANA	18.3	7.4	10.9
NORTH DAKOTA	15.4	6.9	8.5
SOUTH DAKOTA	13.9	8.1	5.8
UTAH	17.8	6.0	11.8
WYOMING	10.5	5.0	5.5

TABLE 19

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	ALL FAMILIES	ALL TEACHERS	PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS
UNITED STATES	13.1	17.1	12.1	32.7
AKRON	14.0	30.7	27.9	34.9
ALBUQUERQUE	12.4	15.6	11.3	29.2
ANAHEIM	12.7	17.3	10.8	42.6
ANCHORAGE	8.3	11.1	6.5	44.5
ARLINGTON VA	17.3	15.6	11.0	32.3
ARLINGTON TX	11.5	14.2	5.9	31.2
ATLANTA	12.6	29.9	17.9	53.8
AURORA CO	7.8	6.8	7.4	4.9
AUSTIN	10.5	12.4	9.8	18.6
BAKERSFIELD	9.7	15.9	15.4	18.2
BALTIMORE	18.1	43.6	31.7	72.3
BATON ROUGE	24.8	41.0	35.7	54.7
BIRMINGHAM	12.6	24.7	23.2	29.0
BOSTON	28.9	48.9	44.6	64.4
BUFFALO	19.5	33.8	27.9	53.6
CHARLOTTE	13.4	15.3	5.5	50.8
CHICAGO	26.6	42.4	36.3	56.1
CINCINNATI	23.1	42.0	29.4	60.1
CLEVELAND	25.2	52.8	39.7	67.6
CO SPRINGS	9.7	10.0	9.1	13.2
COLUMBUS GA	9.6	17.3	11.8	35.7
COLUMBUS OH	15.5	24.9	21.5	29.9
CORP. CHRISTI	10.2	17.6	15.7	23.6
DALLAS	14.1	29.1	20.8	41.1
DAYTON	17.6	39.6	29.8	58.8
DENVER	17.7	33.6	26.7	49.4
DES MOINES	11.0	14.4	7.9	32.0
DETROIT	17.1	36.2	32.7	44.1
EL PASO	7.5	16.3	12.6	26.2
FORT WAYNE	20.6	28.4	18.6	40.9
FORT WORTH	12.3	27.8	23.6	36.2
FREMONT	12.9	18.3	15.0	32.9
FRESNO	6.2	12.1	8.8	26.0
GARLAND	10.4	17.1	11.6	29.7
GLENDALE CA	20.2	19.8	15.8	40.0
GRAND RAPIDS	27.3	55.0	41.1	71.0
GREENSBORO	10.8	15.7	10.0	47.8
HIALEAH	14.3	22.6	20.6	29.4
HONOLULU	31.0	50.5	45.0	63.1

TABLE 19 CONT.

HOUSTON	11.6	23.3	13.9	36.3
HUNT. BEACH	14.8	18.1	13.4	34.9
INDIANAPOLIS	16.6	30.5	23.5	42.6
JACKSON MS	19.0	32.2	23.8	58.5
JACKSONVILLE	16.1	27.3	16.6	55.1
JERSEY CITY	34.4	51.4	50.3	53.3
KANSAS CITY	18.1	29.2	21.2	40.1
LAS VEGAS	10.4	23.4	18.1	48.5
LEX.-FAYETTE	13.7	19.7	13.4	34.7
LINCOLN	13.6	16.5	12.5	28.1
LITTLE ROCK	26.6	40.1	26.4	71.6
LONG BEACH	12.3	15.2	11.6	29.0
LOS ANGELES	19.5	39.1	30.1	56.6
LOUISVILLE	21.4	35.4	23.2	56.9
LUBBOCK	7.6	11.5	7.6	24.8
MADISON	14.1	19.3	13.0	42.8
MEMPHIS	13.8	17.8	9.4	49.2
MESA	7.0	7.9	5.5	19.0
MIAMI	13.2	31.8	31.4	33.3
MILWAUKEE	23.9	44.5	32.9	70.8
MINNEAPOLIS	19.9	37.1	24.8	61.3
MOBILE	24.7	33.6	23.5	59.0
MONTGOMERY	17.9	33.0	19.3	73.6
NASH.-DAVID.	19.1	37.1	22.7	74.4
NEW ORLEANS	26.5	45.5	38.2	61.5
NEW YORK	24.6	37.2	27.9	62.9
NEWARK	18.8	34.2	37.8	23.6
NORFOLK	11.7	22.9	17.3	43.5
OAKLAND	18.0	33.0	28.1	47.9
OKLA. CITY	12.8	20.3	12.0	39.1
OMAHA	21.4	26.5	17.7	40.8
PHILADELPHIA	34.7	45.7	35.9	62.5
PHOENIX	10.1	16.1	12.6	28.2
PITTSBURGH	28.0	46.5	35.4	61.9
PORTLAND OR	14.1	21.7	21.1	23.7
RALEIGH	10.8	12.6	8.9	33.5
RICHMOND	13.4	36.3	21.2	83.6
RIVERSIDE	12.3	14.4	12.4	29.0
ROCHESTER	19.1	36.0	22.7	63.3
SACRAMENTO	13.4	26.1	20.7	54.5
SAN ANTONIO	11.4	23.4	19.4	30.3
SAN DIEGO	11.8	17.5	13.0	33.4
SAN FRAN.	30.1	41.6	36.7	54.7
SAN JOSE	13.0	21.1	15.9	37.7
SANTA ANA	9.6	17.6	3.5	58.6
SEATTLE	28.7	36.3	30.8	49.1
SHREVEPORT	9.4	15.4	10.3	33.3

TABLE 19 CONT.

SPOKANE	12.3	21.7	16.1	32.1
ST. LOUIS	28.4	40.8	31.4	50.3
ST. PAUL	24.2	28.3	23.2	40.4
ST. PETERSB'RG	17.3	22.6	16.0	42.2
STOCKTON	9.8	14.3	8.9	28.6
TACOMA	12.2	26.5	18.1	51.3
TAMPA	16.2	27.1	21.1	46.9
TOLEDO	26.7	49.4	35.8	72.4
TUCSON	11.2	19.1	18.0	22.9
TULSA	16.4	26.8	16.2	46.4
VA BEACH	10.5	15.5	11.8	34.3
WASH. DC	19.7	36.4	28.2	60.7
WICHITA	15.9	21.9	15.1	44.0
YONKERS	34.5	47.2	38.7	74.7

TABLE 20

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE SMALLEST PERCENT OF PARENTS ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

CITY	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
BOSTON	71.1	22.2	6.7	28.9
CHICAGO	73.4	22.4	4.2	26.6
CLEVELAND	74.8	22.5	2.7	25.2
GRAND RAPIDS	72.7	23.6	3.7	27.3
HONOLULU	69.0	25.2	5.8	31.0
JERSEY CITY	65.6	27.5	6.9	34.4
LITTLE ROCK	73.4	23.5	3.1	26.6
NEW ORLEANS	73.5	22.2	4.3	26.5
PHILADELPHIA	65.3	29.4	5.2	34.7
PITTSBURGH	72.0	23.5	4.5	28.0
SAN FRAN.	69.9	25.4	4.7	30.1
SEATTLE	71.3	23.6	5.1	28.7
ST. LOUIS	71.6	25.3	3.1	28.4
TOLEDO	73.3	22.2	4.5	26.7
YONKERS	65.5	30.1	4.4	34.5
UNITED STATES	86.9	10.1	3.0	13.1
AURORA CO	92.2	5.5	2.3	7.8
EL PASO	92.5	5.4	2.1	7.5
FRESNO	93.8	4.6	1.6	6.2
LUBBOCK	92.4	5.2	2.4	7.6
MESA	93.0	4.4	2.6	7.0

TABLE 21

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE SMALLEST PERCENT OF TEACHERS ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

CITY	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
BALTIMORE	56.4	38.8	4.8	43.6
BOSTON	51.1	37.7	11.2	48.9
CHICAGO	57.6	37.5	5.0	42.4
CINCINNATI	58.0	36.6	5.5	42.0
CLEVELAND	47.2	47.4	5.3	52.8
GRAND RAPIDS	45.0	49.4	5.5	55.0
HONOLULU	49.5	39.0	11.4	50.5
JERSEY CITY	48.6	47.0	4.4	51.4
MILWAUKEE	55.5	38.0	6.5	44.5
NEW ORLEANS	54.5	39.9	5.6	45.5
PHILADELPHIA	54.3	36.7	9.0	45.7
PITTSBURGH	53.5	38.9	7.7	46.5
SAN FRAN.	58.4	34.1	7.5	41.6
TOLEDO	50.6	43.9	5.5	49.4
YONKERS	52.8	44.4	2.8	47.2
UNITED STATES	82.9	12.9	4.3	17.1
ANCHORAGE	88.9	6.6	4.5	11.1
AURORA CO	93.2	5.0	1.8	6.8
CO SPRINGS	90.0	8.5	1.5	10.0
LUBBOCK	88.5	10.3	1.2	11.5
MESA	92.1	5.4	2.5	7.9

TABLE 22

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
UNITED STATES	87.9	8.4	3.7	12.1
AKRON	72.1	16.9	11.0	27.9
ALBUQUERQUE	88.7	6.9	4.4	11.3
ANAHEIM	89.2	6.3	4.5	10.8
ANCHORAGE	93.5	2.5	4.1	6.5
ARLINGTON VA	89.0	11.0	0.0	11.0
ARLINGTON TX	94.1	3.1	2.8	5.9
ATLANTA	82.1	10.0	8.0	17.9
AURORA CO	92.6	5.7	1.7	7.4
AUSTIN	90.2	7.2	2.7	9.8
BAKERSFIELD	84.6	9.5	5.8	15.4
BALTIMORE	68.3	26.3	5.4	31.7
BATON ROUGE	64.3	28.6	7.1	35.7
BIRMINGHAM	76.8	18.2	4.9	23.2
BOSTON	55.4	33.7	10.9	44.6
BUFFALO	72.1	17.4	10.5	27.9
CHARLOTTE	94.5	4.6	0.9	5.5
CHICAGO	63.7	31.3	5.1	36.3
CINCINNATI	70.6	24.6	4.8	29.4
CLEVELAND	60.3	34.2	5.5	39.7
CO SPRINGS	90.9	8.3	0.8	9.1
COLUMBUS GA	88.2	9.6	2.2	11.8
COLUMBUS OH	78.5	16.6	4.9	21.5
CORP. CHRISTI	84.3	10.0	5.7	15.7
DALLAS	79.2	17.2	3.6	20.8
DAYTON	70.2	24.1	5.7	29.8
DENVER	73.3	19.1	7.6	26.7
DES MOINES	92.1	5.4	2.6	7.9
DETROIT	67.3	26.6	6.1	32.7
EL PASO	87.4	9.0	3.6	12.6
FORT WAYNE	81.4	14.3	4.3	18.6
FORT WORTH	76.4	16.3	7.3	23.6
FREMONT	85.0	13.0	1.9	15.0
FRESNO	91.2	5.4	3.4	8.8
GARLAND	88.4	8.1	3.6	11.6
GLENDALE CA	84.2	4.9	10.8	15.8
GRAND RAPIDS	58.9	35.2	5.9	41.1
GREENSBORO	90.0	6.1	3.9	10.0
HIALEAH	79.4	18.1	2.4	20.6
HONOLULU	55.0	32.4	12.6	45.0

TABLE 22 CONT.

HOUSTON	86.1	9.0	4.9	13.9
HUNT. BEACH	86.6	8.0	5.3	13.4
INDIANAPOLIS	76.5	17.4	6.0	23.5
JACKSON MS	76.2	19.2	4.6	23.8
JACKSONVILLE	83.4	12.9	3.6	16.6
JERSEY CITY	49.7	47.2	3.2	50.3
KANSAS CITY	78.8	19.4	1.8	21.2
LAS VEGAS	81.9	8.2	9.9	18.1
LEX.-FAYETTE	86.6	8.8	4.5	13.4
LINCOLN	87.5	8.9	3.6	12.5
LITTLE ROCK	73.6	21.6	4.8	26.4
LONG BEACH	88.4	8.8	2.7	11.6
LOS ANGELES	69.9	24.6	5.4	30.1
LOUISVILLE	76.8	17.4	5.8	23.2
LUBBOCK	92.4	6.1	1.5	7.6
MADISON	87.0	5.9	7.1	13.0
MEMPHIS	90.6	7.3	2.1	9.4
MESA	94.5	3.7	1.9	5.5
MIAMI	68.6	24.1	7.3	31 4
MILWAUKEE	67.1	27.8	5.1	32.9
MINNEAPOLIS	75.2	15.8	9.0	24.8
MOBILE	76.5	18.4	5.0	23.5
MONTGOMERY	80.7	13.6	5.7	19.3
NASH.-DAVID.	77.3	16.2	6.5	22.7
NEW ORLEANS	61.8	31.2	6.9	38.2
NEW YORK	72.1	23.9	4.0	27.9
NEWARK	62.2	27.9	9.8	37.8
NORFOLK	82.7	16.4	0.9	17.3
OAKLAND	71.9	21.1	6.9	28.1
OKLA. CITY	88.0	7.0	4.9	12.0
OMAHA	82.3	11.5	6.2	17.7
PHILADELPHIA	64.1	27.9	8.0	35.9
PHOENIX	87.4	8.8	3.8	12.6
PITTSBURGH	64.6	28.3	7.1	35.4
PORTLAND OR	78.9	14.1	7.1	21.1
RALEIGH	91.1	3.3	5.6	8.9
RICHMOND	78.8	19.8	1.4	21.2
RIVERSIDE	87.6	8.1	4.4	12.4
ROCHESTER	77.3	16.4	6.3	22.7
SACRAMENTO	79.3	15.4	5.3	20.7
SAN ANTONIO	80.6	15.0	4.4	19.4
SAN DIEGO	87.0	8.1	4.9	13.0
SAN FRAN.	63.3	28.5	8.2	36.7
SAN JOSE	84.1	12.1	3.8	15.9
SANTA ANA	96.5	3.5	0.0	3.5
SEATTLE	69.2	19.7	11.1	30.8
SHREVEPORT	89.7	8.6	1.6	10.3

TABLE 22 CONT.

SPOKANE	83.9	7.1	9.0	16.1
ST. LOUIS	68.6	25.2	6.2	31.4
ST. PAUL	76.8	17.2	6.0	23.2
ST. PETERSB'RG	84.0	11.0	4.9	16.0
STOCKTON	91.1	5.4	3.5	8.9
TACOMA	81.9	14.2	3.9	18.1
TAMPA	78.9	14.8	6.2	21.1
TOLEDO	64.2	31.8	4.0	35.8
TUCSON	82.0	11.3	6.7	18.0
TULSA	83.8	11.9	4.3	16.2
VA BEACH	88.2	7.8	4.0	11.8
WASH. DC	71.8	23.9	4.4	28.2
WICHITA	84.9	12.4	2.7	15.1
YONKERS	61.3	36.8	1.9	38.7

TABLE 23

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE SMALLEST PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

CITY	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
BATON ROUGE	64.3	28.6	7.1	35.7
BOSTON	55.4	33.7	10.9	44.6
CHICAGO	63.7	31.3	5.1	36.3
CLEVELAND	60.3	34.2	5.5	39.7
GRAND RAPIDS	58.9	35.2	5.9	41.1
HONOLULU	55.0	32.4	12.6	45.0
JERSEY CITY	49.7	47.2	3.2	50.3
MILWAUKEE	67.1	27.8	5.1	32.9
NEW ORLEANS	61.8	31.2	6.9	38.2
NEWARK	62.2	27.9	9.8	37.8
PHILADELPHIA	64.1	27.9	8.0	35.9
PITTSBURGH	64.6	28.3	7.1	35.4
SAN FRAN.	63.3	28.5	8.2	36.7
TOLEDO	64.2	31.8	4.0	35.8
YONKERS	61.3	36.8	1.9	38.7
UNITED STATES	87.9	8.4	3.7	12.1
ANCHORAGE	93.5	2.5	4.1	6.5
ARLINGTON TX	94.1	3.1	2.8	5.9
CHARLOTTE	94.5	4.6	0.9	5.5
MESA	94.5	3.7	1.9	5.5
SANTA ANA	96.5	3.5	0.0	3.5

TABLE 24

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE SMALLEST PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

CITY	ALL PUBLIC	ALL PRIVATE	SOME BOTH	ALL/SOME PRIVATE
BALTIMORE	27.7	68.9	3.3	72.3
BOSTON	35.6	52.0	12.4	64.4
CLEVELAND	32.4	62.4	5.2	67.6
GRAND RAPIDS	29.0	65.9	5.1	71.0
HONOLULU	36.9	54.3	8.8	63.1
LITTLE ROCK	28.4	67.8	3.8	71.6
MILWAUKEE	29.2	61.0	9.7	70.8
MONTGOMERY	26.4	60.6	12.9	73.6
NASH.-DAVID.	25.6	68.2	6.2	74.4
NEW YORK	37.1	54.7	8.1	62.9
PHILADELPHIA	37.5	51.9	10.7	62.6
RICHMOND	16.4	73.3	10.3	83.6
ROCHESTER	36.7	51.1	12.2	63.3
TOLEDO	27.6	64.3	8.1	72.4
YONKERS	25.3	69.0	5.7	74.7
UNITED STATES	67.3	26.6	6.1	32.7
AURORA CO	95.1	2.8	2.1	4.9
AUSTIN	81.4	14.6	4.1	18.6
BAKERSFIELD	81.8	0.0	18.2	18.2
CO SPRINGS	86.8	9.3	3.8	13.2
MESA	81.0	13.4	5.7	19.0

TABLE 25

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL FAMILIES WHO DO SO IS GREATEST; THE ONLY THREE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF ALL PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE PERCENT OF ALL TEACHERS WHO DO SO

CITY	ALL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
BALTIMORE	43.6	18.1	25.5
BOSTON	48.9	28.9	20.0
CINCINNATI	42.0	23.1	18.9
CLEVELAND	52.8	25.2	27.6
DAYTON	39.6	17.6	22.0
DETROIT	36.2	17.1	19.1
GRAND RAPIDS	55.0	27.3	27.7
HONOLULU	50.5	31.0	19.5
LOS ANGELES	39.1	19.5	19.6
MIAMI	31.8	13.2	18.6
MILWAUKEE	44.5	23.9	20.6
NEW ORLEANS	45.5	26.5	19.0
PITTSBURGH	46.5	28.0	18.5
RICHMOND	36.3	13.4	22.9
TOLEDO	49.4	26.7	22.7
UNITED STATES	17.1	13.1	4.0
ARLINGTON VA	15.6	17.3	-1.7
AURORA CO	6.8	7.8	-1.0
GLENDALE CA	19.8	20.2	-0.4

TABLE 26

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

THE SIXTEEN CITIES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL FAMILIES WHO DO SO IS GREATEST; THE SIX OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE NEGATIVE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL FAMILIES WHO DO SO IS GREATEST

CITY	PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
AKRON	27.9	14.0	13.9
BALTIMORE	31.7	18.1	13.6
BATON ROUGE	35.7	24.8	10.9
BIRMINGHAM	23.2	12.6	10.6
BOSTON	44.6	28.9	15.7
CLEVELAND	39.7	25.2	14.5
DAYTON	29.8	17.6	12.2
DETROIT	32.7	17.1	15.6
FORT WORTH	23.6	12.3	11.3
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1	27.3	13.8
HONOLULU	45.0	31.0	14.0
JERSEY CITY	50.3	34.4	15.9
LOS ANGELES	30.1	19.5	10.6
MIAMI	31.4	13.2	18.2
NEW ORLEANS	38.2	26.5	11.7
NEWARK	37.8	18.8	19.0
UNITED STATES	12.1	13.1	-1.0
ARLINGTON VA	11.0	17.3	-6.3
ARLINGTON TX	5.9	11.5	-5.6
CHARLOTTE	5.5	13.4	-7.9
GLENDALE CA	15.8	20.2	-4.4
MEMPHIS	9.4	13.8	-4.4
SANTA ANA	3.5	9.6	-6.1

TABLE 27

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR FAMILIES WHERE ONE OR BOTH PARENTS ARE PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL AND THAT OF ALL FAMILIES WHO DO SO IS GREATEST; THE ONLY ONE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF FAMILIES WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE PERCENT OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO DO SO

CITY	PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	ALL FAMILIES	PERCENT DIFFERENCE
ATLANTA	53.8	12.6	41.2
BALTIMORE	72.3	18.1	54.2
CLEVELAND	67.6	25.2	42.4
DAYTON	58.8	17.6	41.2
GRAND RAPIDS	71.0	27.3	43.7
LITTLE ROCK	71.6	26.6	45.0
MILWAUKEE	70.8	23.9	46.9
MINNEAPOLIS	61.3	19.9	41.4
MONTGOMERY	73.6	17.9	55.7
NASH.-DAVIDSON	74.4	19.1	55.3
RICHMOND	83.6	13.4	70.2
ROCHESTER	63.3	19.1	44.2
SACRAMENTO	54.5	13.4	41.1
SANTA ANA	58.6	9.6	49.0
TOLEDO	72.4	26.7	45.7
UNITED STATES	32.7	13.1	19.6
AURORA CO	4.9	7.8	-2.9

TABLE 28

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, BY RACE AND ETHNICITY, UNITED STATES

PERCENT OF ALL FAMILIES, ALL TEACHERS, PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES	NOT HISPANIC	HISPANIC
ALL FAMILIES	13.1	14.2	8.1	10.8	13.4	10.1
ALL TEACHERS	17.1	17.5	14.2	15.9	17.1	18.7
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	12.1	11.9	12.9	13.6	11.9	16.5
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	32.7	33.9	20.3	24.7	32.9	27.0

TABLE 29

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES AND TEACHERS, BY RACE AND ETHNICITY, UNITED STATES

	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES	NOT HISPANIC	HISPANIC
ALL FAMILIES	81.7	11.6	6.7	92.3	7.7
ALL FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN	76.9	14.4	8.7	89.9	10.1
ALL TEACHERS	87.9	9.0	3.1	96.0	4.0
ALL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	87.7	9.0	3.3	95.6	4.4
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	87.2	9.6	3.2	95.8	4.2
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	86.8	9.7	3.5	95.4	4.6
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	90.2	6.9	2.9	96.4	3.6
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	90.4	6.8	2.8	96.3	3.7

TABLE 30

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY RACE, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
UNITED STATES	14.2	8.1	10.8
AKRON	17.7	6.7	13.2
ALBUQUERQUE	13.6	12.7	8.5
ANAHEIM	14.8	3.5	8.4
ANCHORAGE	8.9	7.0	5.3
ARLINGTON VA	20.4	9.5	11.9
ARLINGTON TX	11.9	9.5	9.8
ATLANTA	55.8	4.7	12.8
AURORA CO	8.1	5.3	10.0
AUSTIN	14.3	3.4	4.6
BAKERSFIELD	11.9	1.1	6.5
BALTIMORE	40.8	8.9	27.2
BATON ROUGE	48.6	7.1	11.5
BIRMINGHAM	29.6	8.1	23.3
BOSTON	47.4	16.4	13.4
BUFFALO	31.3	6.8	9.0
CHARLOTTE	20.9	3.2	10.8
CHICAGO	47.9	14.2	21.5
CINCINNATI	38.5	8.4	19.6
CLEVELAND	48.2	9.0	23.0
CO SPRINGS	11.0	3.1	3.3
COLUMBUS GA	14.4	3.9	13.0
COLUMBUS OH	19.2	7.7	14.6
CORPUS CHRISTI	11.3	6.1	7.4
DALLAS	25.4	4.8	8.3
DAYTON	29.4	6.0	22.7
DENVER	24.9	5.7	8.4
DES MOINES	12.2	2.6	7.1
DETROIT	37.5	13.3	23.6
EL PASO	8.2	5.5	5.6
FORT WAYNE	23.8	9.1	25.6
FORT WORTH	17.9	5.5	5.0
FREMONT	12.1	14.1	14.8
FRESNO	9.2	2.1	2.9
GARLAND	11.3	9.4	6.1
GLENDALE CA	20.7	9.9	19.7
GRAND RAPIDS	38.3	4.2	4.8
GREENSBORO	16.3	3.1	12.8
HIALEAH	14.8	9.5	10.6
HONOLULU	35.4	11.3	30.0
HOUSTON	19.4	5.4	6.1

TABLE 30 CONT.

HUNTINGTON B'CH	15.8	10.4	10.0
INDIANAPOLIS	19.7	9.0	17.7
JACKSON MS	44.5	6.3	63.1
JACKSONVILLE	20.6	6.1	17.0
JERSEY CITY	44.0	23.1	36.6
KANSAS CITY	23.6	9.6	23.7
LAS VEGAS	11.6	6.4	7.6
LEXINGT'N-FAYETTE	16.2	3.2	9.6
LINCOLN	13.8	12.9	6.7
LITTLE ROCK	46.1	4.9	25.1
LONG BEACH	15.3	10.7	9.4
LOS ANGELES	27.4	16.2	11.8
LOUISVILLE	32.8	4.4	20.8
LUBBOCK	9.7	1.8	2.9
MADISON	15.3	5.1	7.1
MEMPHIS	37.7	2.8	21.8
MESA	7.3	4.1	4.4
MIAMI	18.9	5.4	9.3
MILWAUKEE	40.4	7.0	15.7
MINNEAPOLIS	26.3	7.2	7.3
MOBILE	42.3	6.3	18.0
MONTGOMERY	28.4	8.1	8.3
NASH.-DAVIDSON	25.3	6.2	15.3
NEW ORLEANS	62.3	16.8	20.3
NEW YORK	36.8	16.9	15.8
NEWARK	27.3	15.3	18.9
NORFOLK	20.4	4.0	9.1
OAKLAND	32.4	15.8	11.4
OKLAHOMA CITY	15.0	5.8	11.6
OMAHA	24.7	7.1	18.6
PHILADELPHIA	57.1	16.0	24.8
PHOENIX	11.3	5.8	5.6
PITTSBURGH	40.8	6.9	33.5
PORTLAND OR	15.2	10.1	8.4
RALEIGH	14.5	3.3	18.6
RICHMOND	46.1	3.3	24.1
RIVERSIDE	13.3	9.8	10.4
ROCHESTER	32.4	9.6	7.4
SACRAMENTO	17.0	8.1	10.8
SAN ANTONIO	12.8	6.9	8.8
SAN DIEGO	16.1	5.5	6.5
SAN FRANCISCO	44.5	17.8	23.3
SAN JOSE	15.5	10.0	9.3
SANTA ANA	10.8	16.3	6.8
SEATTLE	37.5	10.5	15.7
SHREVEPORT	17.8	2.4	7.0
SPOKANE	12.6	0.0	13.0

TABLE 30 CONT.

ST. LOUIS	60.8	8.6	40.8
ST. PAUL	29.3	6.5	9.2
ST. PETERSBURG	23.1	5.1	20.3
STOCKTON	14.2	3.6	5.5
TACOMA	14.4	4.8	8.5
TAMPA	21.6	6.4	17.5
TOLEDO	30.1	17.4	24.9
TUCSON	13.5	7.6	5.9
TULSA	19.2	6.9	12.0
VIRGINIA BEACH	11.6	5.6	9.5
WASHINGTON DC	61.1	12.0	19.9
WICHITA	18.5	3.4	12.1
YONKERS	43.8	10.6	25.9

TABLE 31

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY RACE, THE THIRTY LARGEST CITIES

CITY	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
UNITED STATES	13.1	14.2	8.1	10.8
AUSTIN	10.5	14.3	3.4	4.6
BALTIMORE	18.1	40.8	8.9	27.2
BOSTON	28.9	47.4	16.4	13.4
CHICAGO	26.6	47.9	14.2	21.5
CLEVELAND	25.2	48.2	9.0	23.0
COLUMBUS OH	15.5	19.2	7.7	14.6
DALLAS	14.1	25.4	4.8	8.3
DENVER	17.7	24.9	5.7	8.4
DETROIT	17.1	37.5	13.3	23.6
EL PASO	7.5	8.2	5.5	5.6
FORT WORTH	12.3	17.9	5.5	5.0
HOUSTON	11.6	19.4	5.4	6.1
INDIANAPOLIS	16.6	19.7	9.0	17.7
JACKSONVILLE	16.1	20.6	6.1	17.0
LOS ANGELES	19.5	27.4	16.2	11.8
MEMPHIS	13.8	37.7	2.8	21.8
MILWAUKEE	23.9	40.4	7.0	15.7
NASH.-DAVID.	19.1	25.3	6.2	15.3
NEW ORLEANS	26.5	62.3	16.8	20.3
NEW YORK	24.6	36.8	16.9	15.8
OKLA. CITY	12.8	15.0	5.8	11.6
PHILADELPHIA	34.7	57.1	16.0	24.8
PHOENIX	10.1	11.3	5.8	5.6
PORTLAND OR	14.1	15.2	10.1	8.4
SAN ANTONIO	11.4	12.8	6.9	8.8
SAN DIEGO	11.8	16.1	5.5	6.5
SAN FRAN.	30.1	44.5	17.8	23.3
SAN JOSE	13.0	15.5	10.0	9.3
SEATTLE	28.7	37.5	10.5	15.7
WASH. DC	19.7	61.1	12.0	19.9

TABLE 32

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY RACE, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

CITY	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
BOSTON	28.9	47.4	16.4	13.4
CHICAGO	26.6	47.9	14.2	21.5
CLEVELAND	25.2	48.2	9.0	23.0
GRAND RAPIDS	27.3	38.3	4.2	4.8
HONOLULU	31.0	35.4	11.3	30.0
JERSEY CITY	34.4	44.0	23.1	36.6
LITTLE ROCK	26.6	46.1	4.9	25.1
NEW ORLEANS	26.5	62.3	16.8	20.3
PHILADELPHIA	34.7	57.1	16.0	24.8
PITTSBURGH	28.0	40.8	6.9	33.5
SAN FRAN.	30.1	44.5	17.8	23.3
SEATTLE	28.7	37.5	10.5	15.7
ST. LOUIS	28.4	60.8	8.6	40.8
TOLEDO	26.7	30.1	17.4	24.9
YONKERS	34.5	43.8	10.6	25.9
UNITED STATES	13.1	14.2	8.1	10.8
AURORA CO	7.8	8.1	5.3	10.0
EL PASO	7.5	8.2	5.5	5.6
FRESNO	6.2	9.2	2.1	2.9
LUBBOCK	7.6	9.7	1.8	2.9
MESA	7.0	7.3	4.1	4.4

TABLE 33

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
UNITED STATES	11.9	12.9	13.6
AKRON	26.5	36.0	0.0
ALBUQUERQUE	10.8	18.9	12.4
ANAHEIM	10.2	0.0	15.7
ANCHORAGE	7.2	0.0	0.0
ARLINGTON VA	13.3	0.0	0.0
ARLINGTON TX	4.8	18.5	21.4
ATLANTA	46.7	8.9	0.0
AURORA CO	7.5	0.0	14.3
AUSTIN	8.3	13.2	23.8
BAKERSFIELD	15.2	0.0	24.1
BALTIMORE	61.5	20.9	0.0
BATON ROUGE	49.2	19.5	0.0
BIRMINGHAM	17.6	25.5	0.0
BOSTON	52.1	27.4	57.9
BUFFALO	36.9	17.2	17.1
CHARLOTTE	7.4	2.6	0.0
CHICAGO	55.4	25.4	25.7
CINCINNATI	37.3	15.2	0.0
CLEVELAND	72.4	20.4	19.4
CO SPRINGS	9.7	0.0	0.0
COLUMBUS GA	14.5	8.2	0.0
COLUMBUS OH	21.7	20.3	35.7
CORPUS CHRISTI	15.5	15.5	16.9
DALLAS	25.6	13.0	26.2
DAYTON	44.8	14.3	0.0
DENVER	31.3	3.6	16.7
DES MOINES	8.3	0.0	0.0
DETROIT	50.8	29.6	57.1
EL PASO	12.6	6.8	14.8
FORT WAYNE	20.7	7.0	0.0
FORT WORTH	28.5	11.0	0.0
FREMONT	12.1	48.8	15.1
FRESNO	9.7	13.1	3.4
GARLAND	7.4	54.4	0.0
GLENDALE CA	18.6	0.0	0.0
GRAND RAPIDS	49.7	14.7	0.0
GREENSBORO	13.9	0.0	0.0
HIALEAH	21.9	0.0	0.0
HONOLULU	42.1	100.0	44.3
HOUSTON	17.2	10.7	3.5

TABLE 33 CONT.

HUNTINGTON B'CH	13.7	0.0	12.1
INDIANAPOLIS	24.3	19.8	20.7
JACKSON MS	51.3	14.7	0.0
JACKSONVILLE	20.4	1.9	22.6
JERSEY CITY	45.4	60.1	41.2
KANSAS CITY	22.3	17.2	60.0
LAS VEGAS	15.2	38.8	22.2
LEXINGT'N-FAYETTE	13.7	8.9	0.0
LINCOLN	12.5	0.0	0.0
LITTLE ROCK	36.1	15.8	0.0
LONG BEACH	11.5	15.7	0.0
LOS ANGELES	32.6	23.7	26.3
LOUISVILLE	28.9	8.7	0.0
LUBBOCK	7.1	16.4	7.4
MADISON	13.7	0.0	0.0
MEMPHIS	20.6	4.7	0.0
MESA	5.5	0.0	10.1
MIAMI	53.8	12.6	25.6
MILWAUKEE	41.1	20.5	12.1
MINNEAPOLIS	25.4	29.6	0.0
MOBILE	33.0	11.3	0.0
MONTGOMERY	28.4	9.5	0.0
NASH.-DAVIDSON	27.3	12.1	0.0
NEW ORLEANS	52.9	34.6	20.0
NEW YORK	30.8	22.5	25.1
NEWARK	58.8	32.8	35.3
NORFOLK	26.4	7.7	0.0
OAKLAND	30.5	30.4	16.0
OKLAHOMA CITY	10.9	7.3	35.6
OMAHA	18.0	21.3	0.0
PHILADELPHIA	46.8	29.0	23.1
PHOENIX	12.0	16.9	17.1
PITTSBURGH	44.2	5.1	0.0
PORTLAND OR	19.9	24.2	44.9
RALEIGH	10.4	2.9	0.0
RICHMOND	64.7	6.1	0.0
RIVERSIDE	11.5	0.0	27.1
ROCHESTER	30.7	6.0	40.0
SACRAMENTO	25.1	8.2	4.8
SAN ANTONIO	20.0	18.4	15.3
SAN DIEGO	13.5	9.4	11.4
SAN FRANCISCO	38.0	19.8	40.3
SAN JOSE	15.0	18.2	20.0
SANTA ANA	0.0	0.0	12.9
SEATTLE	34.3	8.0	22.5
SHREVEPORT	14.9	3.3	0.0
SPOKANE	16.4	0.0	0.0

TABLE 33 CONT.

ST. LOUIS	79.2	13.0	42.9
ST. PAUL	25.8	0.0	19.0
ST. PETERSBURG	18.6	9.2	0.0
STOCKTON	10.4	0.0	0.0
TACOMA	19.0	0.0	77.8
TAMPA	23.1	15.2	38.5
TOLEDO	36.2	36.3	0.0
TUCSON	18.4	0.0	18.6
TULSA	16.7	16.7	0.0
VIRGINIA BEACH	12.9	6.5	0.0
WASHINGTON DC	49.0	24.0	0.0
WICHITA	15.8	9.4	11.4
YONKERS	38.6	33.1	62.5

TABLE 34

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE, THE THIRTY LARGEST CITIES

STATE	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
UNITED STATES	12.1	11.9	12.9	13.6
AUSTIN	9.8	8.3	13.2	23.8
BALTIMORE	31.7	61.5	20.9	0.0
BOSTON	44.6	52.1	27.4	57.9
CHICAGO	36.3	55.4	25.4	25.7
CLEVELAND	39.7	72.4	20.4	19.4
COLUMBUS OH	21.5	21.7	20.3	35.7
DALLAS	20.8	25.6	13.0	26.2
DENVER	26.7	31.3	3.6	16.7
DETROIT	32.7	50.8	29.6	57.1
EL PASO	12.6	12.6	6.8	14.8
FORT WORTH	23.6	28.5	11.0	0.0
HOUSTON	13.9	17.2	10.7	3.5
INDIANAPOLIS	23.5	24.3	19.8	20.7
JACKSONVILLE	16.6	20.4	1.9	22.6
LOS ANGELES	30.1	32.6	23.7	26.3
MEMPHIS	9.4	20.6	4.7	0.0
MILWAUKEE	32.9	41.1	20.5	12.1
NASH.-DAVID.	22.7	27.3	12.1	0.0
NEW ORLEANS	38.2	52.9	34.6	20.0
NEW YORK	27.9	30.8	22.5	25.1
OKLA. CITY	12.0	10.9	7.3	35.6
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	46.8	29.0	23.1
PHOENIX	12.6	12.0	16.9	17.1
PORTLAND OR	21.1	19.9	24.2	44.9
SAN ANTONIO	19.4	20.0	18.4	15.3
SAN DIEGO	13.0	13.5	9.4	11.4
SAN FRAN.	36.7	38.0	19.8	40.3
SAN JOSE	15.9	15.0	18.2	20.0
SEATTLE	30.8	34.3	8.0	22.5
WASH. DC	28.2	49.0	24.0	0.0

TABLE 35

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

CITY	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
BATON ROUGE	35.7	49.2	19.5	0.0
BOSTON	44.6	52.1	27.4	57.9
CHICAGO	36.3	55.4	25.4	25.7
CLEVELAND	39.7	72.4	20.4	19.4
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1	49.7	14.7	0.0
HONOLULU	45.0	42.1	100.0	44.3
JERSEY CITY	50.3	45.4	60.1	41.2
MILWAUKEE	32.9	41.1	20.5	12.1
NEW ORLEANS	38.2	52.9	34.6	20.0
NEWARK	37.8	58.8	32.8	35.3
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	46.8	29.0	23.1
PITTSBURGH	35.4	44.2	5.1	0.0
SAN FRAN.	36.7	38.0	19.8	40.3
TOLEDO	35.8	36.2	36.3	0.0
YONKERS	38.7	38.6	33.1	62.5
UNITED STATES	12.1	11.9	12.9	13.6
ANCHORAGE	6.5	7.2	0.0	0.0
ARLINGTON TX	5.9	4.8	18.5	21.4
CHARLOTTE	5.5	7.4	2.6	0.0
MESA	5.5	5.5	0.0	10.1
SANTA ANA	3.5	0.0	0.0	12.9

TABLE 36

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE, BY CITY

CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF BLACK PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO THE PERCENT OF WHITE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO DO SO

CITY	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	OTHER RACES
UNITED STATES	12.1	11.9	12.9	13.6
AKRON	27.9	26.5	36.0	0.0
ALBUQUERQUE	11.3	10.8	18.9	12.4
ARLINGTON TX	5.9	4.8	18.5	21.4
AUSTIN	9.8	8.3	13.2	23.8
BIRMINGHAM	23.2	17.6	25.5	0.0
CORP. CHRISTI	15.7	15.5	15.5	16.9
FREMONT	15.0	12.1	48.8	15.1
FRESNO	8.8	9.7	13.1	3.4
GARLAND	11.6	7.4	54.4	0.0
HONOLULU	45.0	42.1	100.0	44.3
JERSEY CITY	50.3	45.4	60.1	41.2
LAS VEGAS	18.1	15.2	38.8	22.2
LONG BEACH	11.6	11.5	15.7	0.0
LUBBOCK	7.6	7.1	16.4	7.4
MINNEAPOLIS	24.8	25.4	29.6	0.0
OMAHA	17.7	18.0	21.3	0.0
PHOENIX	12.6	12.0	16.9	17.1
PORTLAND OR	21.1	19.9	24.2	44.9
SAN JOSE	15.9	15.0	18.2	20.0
SANTA ANA	3.5	0.0	0.0	12.9
TOLEDO	35.8	36.2	36.3	0.0
TULSA	16.2	16.7	16.7	0.0

TABLE 37

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, BY INCOME, UNITED STATES

PERCENT OF ALL FAMILIES, ALL TEACHERS, PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL

	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
ALL FAMILIES	13.1	8.4	15.2	24.2
ALL TEACHERS	17.1	15.8	16.4	19.9
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	32.7	32.2	31.7	35.5

TABLE 38

INCOME BREAKDOWN FOR ALL CATEGORIES, UNITED STATES

	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
ALL FAMILIES	49.6	36.3	14.1
ALL FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN	48.9	37.8	13.3
ALL TEACHERS	22.6	51.6	25.8
ALL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	22.7	52.6	24.7
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS	21.5	51.8	26.6
PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	22.0	52.8	25.1
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS	26.1	50.9	23.0
PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN	24.7	51.9	23.4

TABLE 39

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY INCOME, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	8.4	15.2	24.2
AKRON	8.4	22.6	39.6
ALBUQUERQUE	7.9	14.4	26.6
ANAHEIM	7.4	13.7	20.7
ANCHORAGE	5.7	9.6	9.5
ARLINGTON VA	11.4	14.8	26.6
ARLINGTON TX	7.6	12.8	16.4
ATLANTA	4.9	13.9	63.1
AURORA CO	6.4	9.1	7.8
AUSTIN	5.8	14.4	22.4
BAKERSFIELD	5.0	11.5	20.7
BALTIMORE	10.3	28.7	52.0
BATON ROUGE	11.1	38.8	60.5
BIRMINGHAM	8.8	18.6	42.0
BOSTON	18.9	39.6	54.8
BUFFALO	13.7	32.4	54.1
CHARLOTTE	6.2	13.5	33.1
CHICAGO	16.3	40.7	54.9
CINCINNATI	13.3	38.4	55.6
CLEVELAND	18.2	45.2	45.9
CO SPRINGS	8.3	10.9	12.1
COLUMBUS GA	4.7	12.6	33.7
COLUMBUS OH	9.6	20.1	34.8
CORPUS CHRISTI	5.9	14.2	27.7
DALLAS	6.2	19.6	38.3
DAYTON	11.1	32.5	36.0
DENVER	10.5	22.3	47.6
DES MOINES	8.2	13.3	18.9
DETROIT	10.8	30.0	37.0
EL PASO	4.0	13.5	25.2
FORT WAYNE	16.4	24.7	32.4
FORT WORTH	7.3	14.0	39.3
FREMONT	7.2	10.5	20.9
FRESNO	3.4	9.9	14.7
GARLAND	8.2	11.3	13.7
GLENDALE CA	10.0	23.7	39.5
GRAND RAPIDS	15.4	39.5	57.6
GREENSBORO	5.9	10.9	25.5
HIALEAH	8.6	24.9	33.4
HONOLULU	16.4	29.1	52.7
HOUSTON	5.5	15.7	35.0

TABLE 39 CONT.

HUNTINGTON B'CH	10.4	13.6	19.2
INDIANAPOLIS	10.9	19.9	31.4
JACKSON MS	7.6	28.7	67.0
JACKSONVILLE	9.5	19.4	38.3
JERSEY CITY	23.2	47.8	58.0
KANSAS CITY	10.6	24.9	36.4
LAS VEGAS	6.0	11.2	25.7
LEXINGT'N-FAYETTE	8.5	15.1	27.9
LINCOLN	10.6	16.2	13.8
LITTLE ROCK	14.7	31.2	60.6
LONG BEACH	6.9	16.5	25.7
LOS ANGELES	9.8	25.4	45.1
LOUISVILLE	12.3	35.9	54.0
LUBBOCK	5.2	8.9	17.8
MADISON	9.8	16.6	17.6
MEMPHIS	6.2	23.5	50.3
MESA	5.0	7.8	10.6
MIAMI	8.4	23.4	52.1
MILWAUKEE	15.1	41.3	45.1
MINNEAPOLIS	12.5	26.3	40.8
MOBILE	13.1	36.8	64.3
MONTGOMERY	9.2	23.1	52.9
NASH.-DAVIDSON	9.8	25.6	46.6
NEW ORLEANS	16.4	46.4	70.7
NEW YORK	16.1	30.8	47.7
NEWARK	13.9	27.3	33.0
NORFOLK	6.3	19.0	41.9
OAKLAND	10.2	24.0	41.4
OKLAHOMA CITY	8.7	14.4	31.7
OMAHA	15.8	25.5	34.6
PHILADELPHIA	23.6	49.7	61.0
PHOENIX	6.5	11.9	20.6
PITTSBURGH	19.0	41.1	58.2
PORTLAND OR	10.0	17.4	25.2
RALEIGH	6.9	11.2	18.0
RICHMOND	4.5	19.6	61.2
RIVERSIDE	8.2	13.3	21.1
ROCHESTER	13.6	30.5	30.4
SACRAMENTO	7.8	18.7	28.8
SAN ANTONIO	7.2	18.4	24.6
SAN DIEGO	6.5	13.0	25.4
SAN FRANCISCO	17.6	34.0	54.2
SAN JOSE	5.7	13.2	21.6
SANTA ANA	5.8	11.6	20.4
SEATTLE	15.9	33.5	51.4
SHREVEPORT	5.6	11.2	33.6
SPOKANE	8.2	15.8	30.6

TABLE 39 CONT.

ST. LOUIS	18.3	50.1	67.5
ST. PAUL	14.1	32.0	49.3
ST. PETERSBURG	11.2	22.4	36.9
STOCKTON	4.7	15.9	21.5
TACOMA	8.0	15.0	30.7
TAMPA	9.6	20.5	49.9
TOLEDO	17.6	36.2	49.7
TUCSON	7.8	16.0	26.3
TULSA	10.2	19.3	33.7
VIRGINIA BEACH	8.0	10.7	18.0
WASHINGTON DC	9.4	21.9	51.6
WICHITA	9.7	19.0	33.0
YONKERS	16.9	43.4	60.3

TABLE 40

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY INCOME, THE THIRTY LARGEST CITIES

CITY	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	13.1	8.4	15.2	24.2
AUSTIN	10.5	5.8	14.4	22.4
BALTIMORE	18.1	10.3	28.7	52.0
BOSTON	28.9	18.9	39.6	54.8
CHICAGO	26.6	16.3	40.7	54.9
CLEVELAND	25.2	18.2	45.2	45.9
COLUMBUS OH	15.5	9.6	20.1	34.8
DALLAS	14.1	6.2	19.6	38.3
DENVER	17.7	10.5	22.3	47.6
DETROIT	17.1	10.8	30.0	37.0
EL PASO	7.5	4.0	13.5	25.2
FORT WORTH	12.3	7.3	14.0	39.3
HOUSTON	11.6	5.5	15.7	35.0
INDIANAPOLIS	16.6	10.9	19.9	31.4
JACKSONVILLE	16.1	9.5	19.4	38.3
LOS ANGELES	19.5	9.8	25.4	45.1
MEMPHIS	13.8	6.2	23.5	50.3
MILWAUKEE	23.9	15.1	41.3	45.1
NASH.-DAVID.	19.1	9.8	25.6	46.6
NEW ORLEANS	26.5	16.4	46.4	70.7
NEW YORK	24.6	16.1	30.8	47.7
OKLA. CITY	12.8	8.7	14.4	31.7
PHILADELPHIA	34.7	23.6	49.7	61.0
PHOENIX	10.1	6.5	11.9	20.6
PORTLAND OR	14.1	10.0	17.4	25.2
SAN ANTONIO	11.4	7.2	18.4	24.6
SAN DIEGO	11.8	6.5	13.0	25.4
SAN FRAN.	30.1	17.6	34.0	54.2
SAN JOSE	13.0	5.7	13.2	21.6
SEATTLE	28.7	15.9	33.5	51.4
WASHINGTON	19.7	9.4	21.9	51.6

TABLE 41

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR ALL FAMILIES, BY INCOME, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PARENTS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WITH THE SMALLEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

CITY	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
BOSTON	28.9	18.9	39.6	54.8
CHICAGO	26.6	16.3	40.7	54.9
CLEVELAND	25.2	18.2	45.2	45.9
GRAND RAPIDS	27.3	15.4	39.5	57.6
HONOLULU	31.0	16.4	29.1	52.7
JERSEY CITY	34.4	23.2	47.8	58.0
LITTLE ROCK	26.6	14.7	31.2	60.6
NEW ORLEANS	26.5	16.4	46.4	70.7
PHILADELPHIA	34.7	23.6	49.7	61.0
PITTSBURGH	28.0	19.0	41.1	58.2
SAN FRAN.	30.1	17.6	34.0	54.2
SEATTLE	28.7	15.9	33.5	51.4
ST. LOUIS	28.4	18.3	50.1	67.5
TOLEDO	26.7	17.6	36.2	49.7
YONKERS	34.5	16.9	43.4	60.3
UNITED STATES	13.1	8.4	15.2	24.2
AURORA CO	7.8	6.4	9.1	7.8
EL PASO	7.5	4.0	13.5	25.2
FRESNO	6.2	3.4	9.9	14.7
LUBBOCK	7.6	5.2	8.9	17.8
MESA	7.0	5.0	7.8	10.6

TABLE 42

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY INCOME, THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES

CITY	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	9.8	11.6	15.2
AKRON	6.6	26.9	52.2
ALBUQUERQUE	11.1	9.7	15.9
ANAHEIM	6.7	10.6	12.3
ANCHORAGE	6.4	10.1	3.9
ARLINGTON VA	0.0	4.0	20.9
ARLINGTON TX	2.2	10.0	3.2
ATLANTA	15.3	9.8	31.7
AURORA CO	0.0	7.3	13.9
AUSTIN	6.5	11.0	10.6
BAKERSFIELD	11.0	10.2	24.0
BALTIMORE	20.8	32.9	48.0
BATON ROUGE	17.5	39.0	59.1
BIRMINGHAM	17.0	27.2	30.1
BOSTON	24.4	49.6	65.8
BUFFALO	23.2	20.7	49.8
CHARLOTTE	5.7	3.6	8.5
CHICAGO	24.6	39.5	44.1
CINCINNATI	18.5	31.4	39.5
CLEVELAND	37.3	46.5	31.2
CO SPRINGS	3.7	9.1	13.9
COLUMBUS GA	6.7	12.1	20.2
COLUMBUS OH	17.3	19.2	32.4
CORPUS CHRISTI	10.5	16.0	22.2
DALLAS	12.5	20.9	28.8
DAYTON	44.7	29.3	0.0
DENVER	15.7	23.2	50.2
DES MOINES	5.3	10.5	5.2
DETROIT	16.5	35.1	44.2
EL PASO	11.0	13.6	13.1
FORT WAYNE	21.5	20.8	9.6
FORT WORTH	11.4	20.1	50.0
FREMONT	0.0	16.4	17.2
FRESNO	10.2	10.7	3.8
GARLAND	12.7	19.2	2.4
GLENDALE CA	9.8	10.2	22.5
GRAND RAPIDS	22.7	50.0	48.6
GREENSBORO	8.0	8.8	14.4
HIALEAH	0.0	31.8	50.0
HONOLULU	43.2	24.3	60.1
HOUSTON	9.9	12.0	22.5

TABLE 42 CONT.

HUNTINGTON B'CH	16.1	12.2	13.7
INDIANAPOLIS	16.2	27.3	20.9
JACKSON MS	16.9	22.3	56.1
JACKSONVILLE	11.1	14.3	28.7
JERSEY CITY	26.7	57.1	61.1
KANSAS CITY	21.8	21.2	20.4
LAS VEGAS	14.7	15.8	25.1
LEXINGT'N-FAYETTE	15.1	15.6	6.4
LINCOLN	5.7	15.4	8.3
LITTLE ROCK	13.2	26.5	53.3
LONG BEACH	14.9	10.3	11.9
LOS ANGELES	18.9	30.6	36.4
LOUISVILLE	23.6	22.3	24.8
LUBBOCK	10.4	7.1	5.1
MADISON	13.6	9.6	17.1
MEMPHIS	6.6	12.3	6.1
MESA	6.5	6.2	3.3
MIAMI	35.4	23.6	37.8
MILWAUKEE	25.3	37.2	30.1
MINNEAPOLIS	10.5	31.8	25.2
MOBILE	13.0	25.3	50.8
MONTGOMERY	14.5	17.5	38.1
NASH.-DAVIDSON	13.5	21.3	34.7
NEW ORLEANS	27.2	46.1	46.8
NEW YORK	21.4	26.9	33.4
NEWARK	28.8	32.2	61.4
NORFOLK	8.5	17.5	35.8
OAKLAND	18.9	25.5	38.5
OKLAHOMA CITY	16.7	10.8	7.0
OMAHA	18.2	15.9	21.6
PHILADELPHIA	25.4	37.4	47.5
PHOENIX	9.7	12.7	15.5
PITTSBURGH	23.8	46.3	30.0
PORTLAND OR	15.3	20.0	32.3
RALEIGH	3.6	9.8	9.9
RICHMOND	0.0	31.7	26.7
RIVERSIDE	16.5	6.6	18.9
ROCHESTER	30.7	18.2	22.4
SACRAMENTO	8.5	22.7	27.2
SAN ANTONIO	25.2	16.8	16.9
SAN DIEGO	5.6	15.4	13.9
SAN FRANCISCO	12.0	34.7	55.9
SAN JOSE	5.3	14.9	19.3
SANTA ANA	0.0	7.1	0.0
SEATTLE	21.4	31.7	39.1
SHREVEPORT	10.9	7.9	23.8
SPOKANE	4.8	18.7	27.5

TABLE 42 CONT.

ST. LOUIS	21.3	33.2	55.8
ST. PAUL	26.2	22.3	21.9
ST. PETERSBURG	7.9	18.2	22.2
STOCKTON	8.6	8.2	11.0
TACOMA	0.0	25.4	13.3
TAMPA	12.4	19.1	37.6
TOLEDO	16.5	31.3	54.0
TUCSON	20.9	15.5	19.7
TULSA	17.6	13.2	20.7
VIRGINIA BEACH	14.1	11.5	10.4
WASHINGTON DC	25.7	19.2	40.4
WICHITA	14.4	15.6	14.6
YONKERS	25.5	41.4	42.4

TABLE 43

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY INCOME, THE THIRTY LARGEST CITIES

CITY	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
AUSTIN	9.8	6.5	11.0	10.6
BALTIMORE	31.7	20.8	32.9	48.0
BOSTON	44.6	24.4	49.6	65.8
CHICAGO	36.3	24.6	39.5	44.1
CLEVELAND	39.7	37.3	46.5	31.2
COLUMBUS OH	21.5	17.3	19.2	32.4
DALLAS	20.8	12.5	20.9	28.8
DENVER	26.7	15.7	23.2	50.2
DETROIT	32.7	16.5	35.1	44.2
EL PASO	12.6	11.0	13.6	13.1
FORT WORTH	23.6	11.4	20.1	50.0
HOUSTON	13.9	9.9	12.0	22.5
INDIANAPOLIS	23.5	16.2	27.3	20.9
JACKSONVILLE	16.6	11.1	14.3	28.7
LOS ANGELES	30.1	18.9	30.6	36.4
MEMPHIS	9.4	6.6	12.3	6.1
MILWAUKEE	32.9	25.3	37.2	30.1
NASH.-DAVID.	22.7	13.5	21.3	34.7
NEW ORLEANS	38.2	27.2	46.1	46.8
NEW YORK	27.9	21.4	26.9	33.4
OKLA. CITY	12.0	16.7	10.8	7.0
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	25.4	37.4	47.5
PHOENIX	12.6	9.7	12.7	15.5
PORTLAND OR	21.1	15.3	20.0	32.3
SAN ANTONIO	19.4	25.2	16.8	16.9
SAN DIEGO	13.0	5.6	15.4	13.9
SAN FRAN.	36.7	12.0	34.7	55.9
SAN JOSE	15.9	5.3	14.9	19.3
SEATTLE	30.8	21.4	31.7	39.1
WASH. DC	28.2	25.7	19.2	40.4

TABLE 44

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY INCOME, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST; THE FIVE OF THE ONE HUNDRED LARGEST CITIES WITH THE LOWEST PERCENT IN THE SAME CATEGORY

CITY	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
BATON ROUGE	35.7	17.5	39.0	59.1
BOSTON	44.6	24.4	49.6	65.8
CHICAGO	36.3	24.6	39.5	44.1
CLEVELAND	39.7	37.3	46.5	31.2
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1	22.7	50.0	48.6
HONOLULU	45.0	43.2	24.3	60.1
JERSEY CITY	50.3	26.7	57.1	61.1
MILWAUKEE	32.9	25.3	37.2	30.1
NEW ORLEANS	38.2	27.2	46.1	46.8
NEWARK	37.8	28.8	32.2	61.4
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	25.4	37.4	47.5
PITTSBURGH	35.4	23.8	46.3	30.0
SAN FRAN.	36.7	12.0	34.7	55.9
TOLEDO	35.8	16.5	31.3	54.0
YONKERS	38.7	25.5	41.4	42.4
UNITED STATES	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
ANCHORAGE	6.5	6.4	10.1	3.9
ARLINGTON TX	5.9	2.2	10.0	3.2
CHARLOTTE	5.5	5.7	3.6	8.5
MESA	5.5	6.5	6.2	3.3
SANTA ANA	3.5	0.0	7.1	0.0

TABLE 45

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY INCOME, BY CITY

CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE MIDDLE INCOME BRACKET WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE PERCENT OF THOSE IN THE HIGHEST BRACKET WHO DO SO; CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE LOWEST BRACKET WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATER THAN THE PERCENT OF THOSE IN THE MIDDLE BRACKET WHO DO SO

CITY	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
ALBUQUERQUE	11.3	11.1	9.7	15.9
ANCHORAGE	6.5	6.4	10.1	3.9
ARLINGTON TX	5.9	2.2	10.0	3.2
ATLANTA	17.9	15.3	9.8	31.7
AUSTIN	9.8	6.5	11.0	10.6
BAKERSFIELD	15.4	11.0	10.2	24.0
BUFFALO	27.9	23.2	20.7	49.8
CHARLOTTE	5.5	5.7	3.6	8.5
CLEVELAND	39.7	37.3	46.5	31.2
DAYTON	29.8	44.7	29.3	0.0
DES MOINES	7.9	5.3	10.5	5.2
EL PASO	12.6	11.0	13.6	13.1
FORT WAYNE	18.6	21.5	20.8	9.6
FRESNO	8.8	10.2	10.7	3.8
GARLAND	11.6	12.7	19.2	2.4
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1	22.7	50.0	48.6
HONOLULU	45.0	43.2	24.3	60.1
HUNT. BEACH	13.4	16.1	12.2	13.7
INDIANAPOLIS	23.5	16.2	27.3	20.9
KANSAS CITY	21.2	21.8	21.2	20.4
LEX.-FAYETTE	13.4	15.1	15.6	6.4
LINCOLN	12.5	5.7	15.4	8.3
LONG BEACH	11.6	14.9	10.3	11.9
LOUISVILLE	23.2	23.6	22.3	24.8
LUBBOCK	7.6	10.4	7.1	5.1
MADISON	13.0	13.6	9.6	17.1
MEMPHIS	9.4	6.6	12.3	6.1
MESA	5.5	6.5	6.2	3.3
MIAMI	31.4	35.4	23.6	37.8
MILWAUKEE	32.9	25.3	37.2	30.1
MINNEAPOLIS	24.8	10.5	31.8	25.2
OKLAHOMA	12.0	16.7	10.8	7.0
OMAHA	17.7	18.2	15.9	21.6

TABLE 45 CONT.

PITTSBURGH	35.4	23.8	46.3	30.0
RICHMOND	21.2	0.0	31.7	26.7
RIVERSIDE	12.4	16.5	6.6	18.9
ROCHESTER	22.7	30.7	18.2	22.4
SAN ANTONIO	19.4	25.2	16.8	16.9
SAN DIEGO	13.0	5.6	15.4	13.9
SANTA ANA	3.5	0.0	7.1	0.0
SHREVEPORT	10.3	10.9	7.9	23.8
ST. PAUL	23.2	26.2	22.3	21.9
STOCKTON	8.9	8.6	8.2	11.0
TACOMA	18.1	0.0	25.4	13.3
TUCSON	18.0	20.9	15.5	19.7
TULSA	16.2	17.6	13.2	20.7
VA BEACH	11.8	14.1	11.5	10.4
WASHINGTON	28.2	25.7	19.2	40.4
WICHITA	15.1	14.4	15.6	14.6

TABLE 46

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE AND INCOME, THE FIFTEEN LARGEST CITIES

	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
WHITE	11.9	10.2	11.3	14.5
BLACK	12.9	8.1	13.7	20.5
OTHER	13.6	8.1	13.7	22.6
NEW YORK	27.9	21.4	26.9	33.4
WHITE	30.8	30.2	26.7	35.0
BLACK	22.5	13.4	26.7	27.8
OTHER	25.1	20.1	29.4	26.6
LOS ANGELES	30.1	18.9	30.6	36.4
WHITE	32.6	22.6	33.3	36.1
BLACK	23.7	15.5	26.0	31.9
OTHER	26.3	13.4	24.7	43.3
CHICAGO	36.3	24.6	39.5	41.1
WHITE	55.4	43.2	55.8	63.0
BLACK	25.4	18.4	30.5	25.2
OTHER	25.7	15.2	25.8	62.7
HOUSTON	13.9	9.9	12.0	22.5
WHITE	17.2	14.2	14.2	23.2
BLACK	10.7	8.3	9.6	23.5
OTHER	3.5	3.4	4.9	0.0
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	25.4	37.4	47.5
WHITE	46.8	44.1	45.9	50.0
BLACK	29.0	20.6	29.2	46.6
OTHER	23.1	17.1	34.1	0.0
SAN DIEGO	13.0	5.6	15.4	13.9
WHITE	13.5	5.0	16.1	14.5
BLACK	9.4	18.8	8.3	0.0
OTHER	11.4	0.0	15.2	15.8
DETROIT	32.7	16.5	35.1	44.2
WHITE	50.8	30.8	50.7	65.7
BLACK	29.6	13.0	32.3	40.9
OTHER	57.1	63.2	50.0	0.0
DALLAS	20.8	12.5	20.9	28.8
WHITE	25.6	19.7	26.8	27.0
BLACK	13.0	8.1	11.1	28.7
OTHER	26.2	7.1	31.7	100.0

TABLE 46 CONT.

PHOENIX	12.6	9.7	12.7	15.5
WHITE	12.0	10.2	12.2	13.3
BLACK	16.9	16.4	22.0	0.0
OTHER	17.1	5.6	16.9	63.6
SAN ANTONIO	19.4	25.2	16.8	16.9
WHITE	20.0	26.5	17.8	16.4
BLACK	18.4	23.7	14.9	18.0
OTHER	15.3	19.6	5.7	25.8
SAN JOSE	15.9	5.3	14.9	19.3
WHITE	15.0	7.4	12.7	19.0
BLACK	18.2	0.0	11.9	23.8
OTHER	20.0	0.0	28.7	19.5
INDIANAPOLIS	23.5	16.2	27.3	20.9
WHITE	24.3	24.2	27.7	18.0
BLACK	19.8	0.0	26.8	34.4
OTHER	20.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
BALTIMORE	31.7	20.8	32.9	48.0
WHITE	61.5	35.5	61.9	90.2
BLACK	20.9	16.9	21.7	26.8
OTHER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN FRAN.	36.7	12.0	34.7	55.9
WHITE	38.0	12.6	32.3	60.4
BLACK	19.8	0.0	31.3	0.0
OTHER	40.3	22.2	40.0	47.4
JACKSONVILLE	16.6	11.1	14.3	28.7
WHITE	20.4	15.3	17.0	33.1
BLACK	1.9	0.0	3.8	0.0
OTHER	22.6	0.0	22.6	0.0

TABLE 47

PRIVATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS, BY RACE AND INCOME, BY CITY

THE FIFTEEN CITIES WHERE THE PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS WHO ENROLL ALL OR SOME OF THEIR CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOL IS GREATEST

	TOTAL	<$35 K	$35-$70 K	>$70 K
UNITED STATES	12.1	9.8	11.6	15.2
WHITE	11.9	10.2	11.3	14.5
BLACK	12.9	8.1	13.7	20.5
OTHER	13.6	8.1	13.7	22.6
BATON ROUGE	35.7	17.5	39.0	59.1
WHITE	49.2	29.9	52.6	62.7
BLACK	19.5	8.4	21.9	50.0
OTHER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
BOSTON	44.6	24.4	49.6	65.8
WHITE	52.1	13.1	52.2	69.1
BLACK	27.4	16.8	48.4	0.0
OTHER	57.9	59.5	33.3	85.0
CHICAGO	36.3	24.6	39.5	44.1
WHITE	55.4	43.2	55.8	63.0
BLACK	25.4	18.4	30.5	25.2
OTHER	25.7	15.2	25.8	62.7
CLEVELAND	39.7	37.3	46.5	31.2
WHITE	72.4	83.5	68.8	28.6
BLACK	20.4	5.5	31.7	31.7
OTHER	19.4	30.0	0.0	0.0
GRAND RAPIDS	41.1	22.7	50.0	48.6
WHITE	49.7	35.1	57.3	44.9
BLACK	14.7	0.0	0.0	56.0
OTHER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HONOLULU	45.0	43.2	24.3	60.1
WHITE	42.1	36.8	22.2	62.0
BLACK	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
OTHER	44.3	39.0	23.2	59.7
JERSEY CITY	50.3	26.7	57.1	61.1
WHITE	45.4	25.7	54.7	42.0
BLACK	60.1	25.5	63.1	100.0
OTHER	41.2	30.8	52.0	0.0
MILWAUKEE	32.9	25.3	37.2	30.1
WHITE	41.1	39.7	40.8	43.7
BLACK	20.5	17.1	28.8	0.0
OTHER	12.1	0.0	38.9	0.0

TABLE 47 CONT.

NEW ORLEANS	38.2	27.2	46.1	46.8
WHITE	52.9	16.2	69.8	72.3
BLACK	34.6	29.2	40.3	33.9
OTHER	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
NEWARK	37.8	28.8	32.2	61.4
WHITE	58.8	28.2	100.0	100.0
BLACK	32.8	26.7	26.3	51.4
OTHER	35.3	42.9	30.0	0.0
PHILADELPHIA	35.9	25.4	37.4	47.5
WHITE	46.8	44.1	45.9	50.0
BLACK	29.0	20.6	29.2	46.6
OTHER	23.1	17.1	34.1	0.0
PITTSBURGH	35.4	23.8	46.3	30.0
WHITE	44.2	43.3	52.9	33.1
BLACK	5.1	0.0	0.0	17.1
OTHER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SAN FRAN.	36.7	12.0	34.7	55.9
WHITE	38.0	12.6	32.3	60.4
BLACK	19.8	0.0	31.3	0.0
OTHER	40.3	22.2	40.0	47.4
TOLEDO	35.8	16.5	31.3	54.0
WHITE	36.2	21.2	32.2	49.4
BLACK	36.3	13.8	28.8	66.1
OTHER	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
YONKERS	38.7	25.5	41.4	42.4
WHITE	38.6	31.9	37.9	42.6
BLACK	33.1	0.0	53.6	29.6
OTHER	62.5	100.0	42.3	100.0

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Denis Philip Doyle, founder of DOYLE ASSOCIATES, is a nationally and internationally known education writer, analyst and consultant. After earning his BA ('62) and MA ('64) in Political Theory at the University of California at Berkeley, Doyle became a consultant to the California legislature; since then he has been Assistant director of the US Office of Economic Opportunity and an Assistant Director of the National Institute of Education.

He has been a Federal Executive Fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and a Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute where he was codirector of the Modern Red School House (a project of the New American Schools Development Corporation).

He was appointed by Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander to serve on the National Education Commission on Time and Learning, and he coedited the Commission's final report, *Prisoners of Time.*

With David T. Kearns he co-authored *Winning the Brain Race: A Bold Plan to Make Our Schools Competitive.* His most recent book is *Reinventing Education: Entrepreneurship in America's Public Schools* co-authored with IBM CEO Lou Gerstner, Roger Semerad, and William Johnston. Doyle has written more than 150 op eds. for major newspapers and dozens of scholarly and popular articles.

Doyle and his wife Gloria Revilla are the products of public school and sent their two children to public and private schools. He lives and works in Chevy Chase MD.

ABOUT THE RESEARCHER

Amanda Catherine Rice graduated from Yale University in 1994, majoring in Literature with a concentration in Cultural Criticism. After earning her BA, she worked as a Research Assistant for Doyle Associates in Chevy Chase MD. Upon completion of the study Ms. Rice left Doyle Associates to travel and study in Mexico; she then plans to move to the California Bay Area to work on community issues and pursue her interest in art. Ms. Rice attended public school in Washington DC for thirteen years before going to college.

ORDERING INFORMATION

Spiral bound copies of this report can be ordered directly from the

Center for Education Reform:
1001 Connecticut Avenue NW
Suite 920
Washington DC 20036
202-822-9000

The complete data run is available on flexible data discs which may be ordered directly from the Bureau of the census for a copying fee.

The discs contain data for all 50 states and the nation's 100 largest cities, by teacher, public and private, as well as all families, by race (white, black, other) and ethnicity (non-Hispanic and Hispanic) as well as three income breakdowns: the national family median, twice the median and the range between the median and twice the median (< $35K/ $35K-$70K/ >$70K).

Ask for Special Tabulation Package (STP-181) and specify 5.25" or 3.5" disc.
Contact:

Ms. Nancy Sweet, Statistician
Population Division
Bureau of the Census
Washington DC 20233
301-457-2429
FAX 301-457-2643